LABOUR MONTHLY

EDITOR R. PALME DUTT

THE URGENT CALL OF MAY DAY
William Gallacher, M.P.

INTERNATIONALISM AND UNITY
Will Lawther

SYMPOSIUM ON AFFILIATION
Percy Allott, D. F. Sharman, J.P., J. Stanley, T. Scrafton & E. Parker

THE ROAD TO LABOUR UNITY
R Palme Dutt

STIRRINGS IN IRELAND
William Rust

INDIAN CRISIS
Ben Bradley

BOOK REVIEWS

THE URGENT CALL OF MAY DAY

6D

MAY 1943

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY DEVELOPMENT FUND

Total received in April, 1943: £55 : 17 : 4

THE DECISIVE MONTHS...

"Now that the decisive months of the war and the future are immediately before us the LABOUR MONTHLY has a tremendous part to play in helping us to find the way forward and I am certain that it will continue, as it has done in the past, to perform that task with honour and determination."

This very fine statement of the role of LABOUR MONTHLY was backed up by a very generous donation—one of the largest on our list this month—but the total of the Development Fund, although an improvement on last month, is little more than half the sum we set ourselves in January. We regret to note little response from Discussion Groups to the Prize Offer about which they are all well informed. In case Groups think donations should not be sent in until the expiry of the three months' period, will they please note that this is not so: donations should be sent in ALL THE TIME. It is the totals that count in the final judgment.

So, comrades, perform *your* task with honour and determination also. By sending us the biggest donation you can raise you are helping us to perform ours.

	£	s.	d.
Holborn D.G.		2	0
R. E.		10	0
C. Watson		1	6
Sheaf		5	0
Islington D.G.		8	3
C. Watson		5	0
Samuel Hill	1	0	0
R. F. (Oldhamite)		5	0
G. Barnett		3	0
[illegible]		5	0
[illegible]		3	0
C. Baker		3	6
[illegible]		3	0
T. Horlock		1	6
C. Oliver		1	6
A. Stewart	1	0	0
Shelley D.G.		16	4
[illegible]		14	0
A. Grant		3	0
W. Hill		2	6
[illegible]	1	1	0
G. Hewitt		3	0
A. Adams	1	1	0
D. Adams	1	1	0
E. Russell	1	3	0
R. Henry		3	6
Anon.		13	0
T. Roy		18	0
M. Curran		1	0
M. Haddock		3	6
J. Carr		3	0
A. Walker		7	0
L. V. L.		13	0
Unitarian		2	0
Wellwisher	2	2	0
D.29, R.A.S.C.		2	6
J. Despicht		1	6
U. Cox		14	0
J. B.		5	0
A. Wall		5	0
P. Freeman		3	0
E. Beck		3	6
R. Sleet		7	6

	£	s.	d.
G. Burn		5	0
F. Wood		7	6
D. Cass		2	6
M. Arensen		1	0
H. Whiteley		3	0
M. Deakin		3	0
Maidenhead D.G.		10	6
I. Schloss	1	13	0
E. Tucker		5	0
Barnstaple D.G.		14	6
D. Robinson		2	6
A. Foreman		1	3
R. Green		5	0
Clifton D.G.		6	0
W. Lakin-Smith		2	6
D. Maccoby		1	6
A. P. D. G.		10	0
Edinburgh D.G.		5	6
Penrith D.G.		10	0
F. Quelon	2	0	0
D. Rees		10	0
J. McLean		2	6
H. E. C.		5	0
T. Senior		8	0
E. Luce	1	0	0
J. M.		3	0
T. Blomley		6	0
Anon, Whitchurch		1	0
C. Levy	1	0	0
W. Griffiths		10	0
Russophile		5	0
L. Metzger		1	0
An A.T.		2	6
Q. Z.		4	0
R. F. B.	2	0	0
D. King		3	0
Pontypool D.G.		3	6
Samuel Mill		10	0
K. H.		1	0
Dunoon D.G.	1	0	0
L'Humanite		2	0

	£	s.	d.
E. Maguire		6	0
Socialist Sailor	2	10	0
R. R. R.	1	0	0
C. Robson		5	0
A. Dipple		3	0
Windfall		10	0
Llanidloes		2	0
P. Ibbotson		3	0
C. Candler		3	0
B. Baily		7	0
Eric and Norah	2	0	0
J. Penistan		13	0
C. Milne		3	0
E. McKercher		3	0
Red Craftsman, R.E.M.E.		10	0
Morden D.G.		5	0
I. McIntyre		3	0
T. Harding		13	0
J. Lansley		2	6
L. Phildius	1	0	0
W. Laithwaite		13	0
P. Andrews	1	0	0
D. Smith		3	0
J. Ruddock	1	1	0
M. Mertens		1	6
J. Williams		5	0
Anon, Reading		5	0
Dr. Barrov		13	0
J. Fraser		3	0
Carshalton C.P.		10	0
R. Pearson		2	6
R. Millar		1	0
T. Nightingale		3	6
E. McCallum		5	0
S. Craven		13	0
R. Russell	2	0	0
H. S. M.		5	0
R. R.		10	0
H. Thomas		3	0

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XXV. No. 5

CONTENTS

May, 1943

	Page
The Urgent Call of May Day by WILLIAM GALLACHER, M.P.	129
Internationalism and Unity by WILL LAWTHER	133
Symposium on Affiliation by PERCY ALLOTT, D. F. SHARMAN, J.P., J. STANLEY, T. SCRAFTON and ERNEST PARKER	136
Road to Labour Unity—III. Communism and the Labour Movement by R. PALME DUTT	142
Stirrings in Ireland by WILLIAM RUST	151
Indian Crisis by BEN BRADLEY	153
Book Reviews—	
Inside Nazi Germany by HANS KAHLE	158
Marx-Engels Selections by WILLIAM RUST	159
Travesty of Jaurés by WILLIAM ZAK	160

The Urgent Call of May Day

by WILLIAM GALLACHER, M.P.

NEVER was the call of May Day so urgent, so insistent, as it is on this great year of 1943. Year after year the massed banners of the working class movement have flung their challenge to reaction and spurred the workers on to ever greater efforts. But never before has the fate of humanity been so precariously balanced as it is to-day. Fascist slavery shackles the limbs of millions of European workers. For them no triumphal marches, no waving flags or scarlet banners on the workers' day of May.

Crushed under the iron heel of Nazi brutality they await the day of liberation to rise and destroy their bestial enemies.

Boasting of their invincibility, the Nazi hordes swept through those European countries, whose gates, in most cases, were opened to them by servile traitors.

But against the unbreakable unity of the Soviet Union and its mighty Red Army the vaunted invincibility was forever smashed. The Nazi war machine can be destroyed. But it must be destroyed now before it has a chance to recover from the terrible blows inflicted on it by the Red Army.

Every day of delay is a day won for Hitler. That is the all-compelling message that events present to the workers. Full military co-operation with the Soviet Union, which means invasion of Europe, and the Nazi forces will be finished. But that military co-operation must be insisted on by the whole powerful forces of the working class.

May Day demands the immediate opening of the Second Front in Europe.

To hesitate is to lose the greatest opportunity ever presented for an early and victorious end of the war.

It is madness to underestimate the still great power of the Nazis. They hold all the countries of Europe under their command. These millions of people they will use as slaves in their war factories, the younger men will be driven remorselessly to the fighting fronts.

We welcome, on this May Day, the heroic deeds of the Eighth Army, and of the American, French and British First Armies in North Africa, but the victories there, great as they are, cannot be decisive. The war will be won or lost on the European continent.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And on that continent Hitler has 300 million of a population to draw on or coerce, as against 135 million in the Soviet Union.

To leave it to the Soviet Union, in such circumstances, would be to play with disaster. The Nazis count on the delay in opening a Second Front for a new offensive against the Red Army. If such an offensive met with even a measure of success it might well give them the opportunity of stabilising in the East and turning to an offensive in the West. The danger is great—speedy action is the one sure way to avert it. In such a situation complacency plays right into the hands of the Nazis. They want us to lie back—and leave it to the experts. At the same time it suits the purpose of those hidden enemies of the working class who use their powerful behind-the-scenes influence against a Second Front and for a deal with Hitler. Complacency amongst the people is the soil from which disaster can easily come. At all costs, complacency must be eradicated and vigorous activity become the order of the day. But the people of France, of Belgium, of Holland, of Norway, and of all occupied countries want us to move without delay. They are being bled white. Last year they eagerly awaited us. Full of fight, ready to join with us. Time and again they were told on the radio to be patient and wait a little longer—we were coming soon. But week followed week, and month followed month, and the day of liberation was still as distant as ever. But while they waited, the Nazis didn't wait. They forced them into trains for slave labour in Germany. Thousands of the best sons of France, eagerly waiting to join us in the struggle, are now hopeless captives in Germany or victims of the Gestapo and the executioner's block. Every day's delay reduces the strength of our Allies in the occupied countries, every day's delay increases their despair. A Second Front on May Day would see the greatest rising of the European peoples the world has ever witnessed. "Workers of all lands, unite" would have a meaning pregnant with great events for the future of the working class.

But the Second Front is still in the future, while the Nazis carry through a mobilisation of every available man and woman in Europe. With such a mobilisation they are capable of springing upon us very dangerous surprises. If we wait till they strike, we may have waited too long. "Strike first and strike hard" was the advice of the late Lord Fisher. It is good advice in the present situation.

But instead of a full mobilisation of our forces for the purpose of "striking first and striking hard," our political leaders and our big financial and industrial magnates are concentrating their attention more and more on securing their property and power intact when the war is over. "Praise the Lord and think about the future." That was the keynote of the song so tunelessly sung by the Chancellor of the Exchequer when he introduced his budget. It is the brazen chant of one after another of the big monopolists. We are getting through all right, the Chancellor told us. Of course, we had to enforce Government control in a number of directions or we would have been faced with ruin and disaster. But when the war is over private enterprise, that would have brought ruin upon us, is to have its head again, and special concessions have to be made to those who have suffered unduly as a result of the E.P.T. (as a result of making too much profit). For you understand that private enterprise, which smashed up the shipyards, closed down steel mills and turned whole areas derelict —private enterprise is, alone, capable of running industry. Of course, it is not true. The facts give the lie to all their bombastic claims and it is because the facts expose them, that they turn their attention more

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and more away from the war and concern themselves with every kind of intrigue for ensuring the maximum control when the war is over. They are even now, in the inner circles, discussing plans for exploiting China and for exploiting the Baltic States, conveniently forgetting that this latter is Soviet territory.

All this plays nicely into the hands of the Nazis, as does the discussions now going on about territorial claims on the part of those who, so far, have done little of the fighting.

The greatest efforts are necessary to make a real mobilisation in this country in the sense of marshalling all our resources, particularly finance, for the winning of the war. Every penny spent on behalf of the soldiers and their dependants, every penny spent on behalf of the old age pensioners and on widows' pensions, every penny spent on the care of our children, all of this, as with money spent in the service of the people generally, is a means of strengthening national unity and the strong will to victory. Every economy for the purpose of saving and maintaining property and privilege is a stab in the back to the men who are bearing the burden of the struggle.

Along with the fight for national unity must go a real effort to get effective unity of the allied nations. The discussions that are going on just now between certain groups within a particular nationality or between one nationality and another must be brought to a satisfactory conclusion. But, above all, the pro-Fascist, anti-Soviet activity of certain of the Polish gentry must be dealt with by the Foreign Office, or, if need be, by the Home Office. The spreading of Goebbels's propaganda in this country by these reactionary Polish militarists cannot be tolerated.

Nor is it desirable to have feeling aroused and suspicion created between Britain and the United States of America on such questions as air bases after the war, or over the rival schemes of currency and finance. What is wanted, above all else, is the opening of the Second Front and the closest collaboration between Britain, the Soviet Union, America and China. This will make victory certain and prepare the way for a great new advance of the people in all parts of the world.

But on no question do we find the post-war mind more active than in relation to India. Instead of seeing in India a great ally in the war against Fascism—in the fight for freedom, and so shaping their policy as to win the whole Indian people for the struggle, they look to the end of the war and to an India still under imperialist control and what they want after the war determines what they do now. But the people of this country want India free, want the Indian people as their allies, and so this May Day makes a special call—the liberation of the Congress leaders for new negotiations, leading up to a national Indian Government and Indian independence.

In home affairs the question of unity becomes ever more pressing. With unity the working class and progressive forces would be overwhelmingly strong and the various manifestations of Fascism would be swept out of existence.

Where the movement is healthy there is no chance for the rotten germ of Fascism to develop. Where the movement is weak, this black disease readily makes its way. What is the position to-day? In many parts of the country the Labour Party is inactive. Quite passive in a time when the greatest activity is demanded. This is notorious. It is often lamented by the Labour leaders themselves, who fail to appreciate the fact that they are responsible for the lack of life in their movement. But this lack of life, this passivity, provides a breeding-ground for the dark forces. In every direction they are springing up—these weeds that seek to choke out the life of the working-class

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

movement. They creep around in the black-out, slandering and defiling. They take on a new guise as the British National Party*, only to throw this off and take on another colour (the "Merrie England" party) when they are completely exposed in the courts.

But worst of all is the success they are meeting with in the foul Jew-baiting propaganda, that is recognised as an essential feature of all Nazi policy. "Jew-baiting" in Germany was used to disrupt and then destroy the working class movement. "Jew-baiting" is being used here for the same purpose. If the ranks of the workers can be broken, national unity will be destroyed, and the Nazis can become the masters of Europe. Don't tolerate the anti-Semitic, however plausible he tries to make his appeal. May Day unites all working class progressive people, regardless of race or creed.

But there is another way of disrupting the working class, and one that seems to strike a popular note at the moment. The breaking of the electoral truce has been boosted up as a sort of cure-all for every problem that now confronts us. Local Labour Parties make it an excuse for their failure to function. But the breaking of the electoral truce would only affect an odd Labour Party here and there and only for the short period of the by-elections. It is not a question of the electoral truce that is the trouble with the local Labour Parties. What they want, what they need, is a clear policy vigorously presented. That is what the Communist Party has, that is what it can give to the Labour Party. Life—keen, active political life. That is the essential meaning of the policy of affiliation. True, a number of Independents have been returned at by-elections; but this is mainly because of the general discontent with the present method of selecting members for Parliament.

It is no wonder, for some sorry specimens have been chosen. But this is no reason for breaking the electoral truce, which means destroying the National Government. We want a new method of selection of candidates, through conferences where all the forces in the constituency will be represented, so that the very best will be chosen and the Government, as a consequence, be strengthened by the choice. We want more representatives of the progressive forces, and we want more Labour representatives in the Government. We want the greatest measure of national unity, and we want the Government changed and strengthened so that it will truly represent and express the desires of the great mass of the people.

The labour movement can give a real lead on these issues to the people of this country, more especially if they overcome their violent anti-Communist prejudices and face up to the meaning of Communist Party affiliation. This would give new life, new enthusiasm, new inspiration to the whole labour movement. It would have a terrific effect on the movement throughout Europe and would be a great advance towards international unity.

And international unity is the great, outstanding message of May Day.

Let the call go out as the May Day banners stream through the streets. Unity of all working class and progressive forces, full military co-operation with the Soviet Union, the Second Front in Europe, full mobilisation for victory; then with all the peoples of Europe and the world the march goes on, for the end of exploitation of man by man, and the opening up of the new world of socialism.

"WORKERS OF ALL LANDS, UNITE!"

* Craven, given a life sentence for treachery, had declared his association with and support for the British National Party.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Internationalism and Unity

by WILL LAWTHER

(President of the Miners' Federation of Great Britain)

THE Miners' Federation of Great Britain, through its Executive Committee and on the basis of previous M.F.G.B. decisions, decided to throw its strong support for increasing the strength of the working-class movement by the affiliation of the Communist Party to the Labour Party. I want in this article to put forward the reasons for this decision, and also to deal with some aspects of the campaign being carried on in some Labour Party organs, including their attacks upon the Miners' Federation.

Affiliation is not simply the question of acceptance or otherwise of an addition to the ranks of the Labour Party. Coming up at this time it involves the whole question of the war effort, the strengthening of the working-class movement. The present war situation is the most urgent, but the future is also involved; and what concerns the future of the working-class concerns also the whole people of Britain.

The first and foremost reason for the Labour Party Conference at Whitsun accepting the affiliation of the Communist Party is to be found in the present war situation. The war against Fascism; the war for the defence of our liberties against Fascist tyranny, for the utter defeat of Fascist Germany, for the total destruction of the Nazi regime, this is the condition of our continued existence.

A grim, terrible, bloody task: this is what we have to keep in the forefront of our minds; this is what we have to do for the sake of our families and our children, for the sake of our movement and of the whole British people, for the sake of mankind. It is easy to shrink from such a task, easy to forget all that it means and demands of us, easy to step back into old habits of mind, old prejudices, or to let minds and energies be bent on imaginary futures. For all futures are imaginary, if this beast in Europe is not caught and caged and dealt with. To the extent that the working-class movement is bent upon this, gathering its whole potential strength for this, to that same extent it will be powerful enough to decide upon and gain that better future to which our trade unions and co-operatives are entitled to look forward.

To concentrate on the winning of the war is therefore the supreme duty of every trade unionist; and every question has to be judged in the light of this. This is why the Labour Party decided upon national unity, entered into the electoral truce and then agreed to enter the Churchill coalition Government—which some of us were censured for suggesting in 1938. This is why the Labour Party should also welcome the affiliation of the Communist Party.

For not only is it utterly illogical to refuse affiliation but it is also opposed to the building up of that unity. It is illogical to say that while the Labour Party can work with the Tories and Liberals it cannot work with the Communist Party. If persons of such different ideological standpoints as Churchill, Stalin, Roosevelt can work together, with the support of the Labour Party, then it is illogical to say that with the British Communists there can be no joint working or co-operation. To insist on continuing the split in the working-class movement while insisting on remaining in the coalition, which I agree with, and on stopping splits in national unity, is the height of illogicality.

But worse than its illogicality is its definite hindrance to national unity. National unity is not firmly welded together: and so long as the working-class movement which should be the very core and centre of unity is itself split, the weakness in national unity will persist.

When I read some of the frenzied denunciations of the affiliation proposal,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when I hear some of the reckless arguments used, I sometimes wonder if the national peril has been lost sight of, if the need for national unity has been forgotten.

Can there be men in our movement who, instead of making the present war situation the test of policy, are basing their views on what happened in the past. If so, then they should not be willing to join with Tories, who have done so much damage in the past and who even now stubbornly refuse to repeal the Trade Union and Trade Disputes Act and other "controversial" questions.

When we hear the arguments of a Ramsay MacDonald being trotted out against Communist Party affiliation, then I rub my eyes and wonder if some of the Labour Party officials are blind to the national emergency and the needs of the war situation. He is dead, but his spirit liveth on.

I am not a member of the Communist Party: and, unlike some of those who are now reviling it, I have never been a member. But I have to work with Communists, and I find them as good trade unionists as most, and better than many: I find them loyal colleagues: and I am prepared to have a closer association with them within the Labour Party in the struggle against Hitler.

I have disagreed with them before: I may have to disagree with them in the future. But the future we will settle when we come to it. Fears of the future, put about by those whose minds are dwelling in the past, are not going to terrify me away from my plain duty of getting the maximum co-operation at the present. A line of argument which would split the United Nations is still less applicable within our own movement.

The Miners' Federation stands for affiliation because it believes in unity; because when there is no unity, Fascism triumphs. As I wrote three weeks ago, "Miners are cold realists. They know where Fascism wins, it is the miners who are marked out for the most brutal and terrible treatment. We do not forget the sufferings of the miners of the Asturias, of France and Belgium, of the mining populations of Lidice and the Donetz. We stand for unity at home and abroad. That is our case for affiliation."

The main argument used by the opponents of affiliation is an extraordinary reckless argument. They say they are against the association with the Communist International. But in putting forward this argument in the way they do, they cut at the whole international outlook of the labour movement. They play into the hands of reactionary opponents of the labour movement, who were always opposed to its international connections and international standpoint. They hide the fact that the Labour Party itself is part of an international organisation, the Labour and Socialist International.

How many of those who have read the *Daily Herald's* outpourings against Communist affiliation (following upon the *Daily Telegraph*) are aware that the Labour and Socialist International also limits the autonomy of its individual sections? Here are the rules on this point, the rules of the Labour and Socialist International:—

> The Labour and Socialist International can only become a reality if its decisions in all international questions are binding on its affiliated bodies.
>
> The resolutions of the International will therefore imply a self-imposed limitation of the autonomy of the affiliated organisations.

The Miners' Federation, shortly after its beginning over 60 years ago, took the leading part in founding the Miners' International. Our complaint, based on our experience, was that the Miners' International was not strong enough, and that it required to be strengthened. The same was true of the other international organisations. But here we have arguments put forward that would sap the spirit and the expression of all internationalism in the labour movement, and would make a mockery of the old slogan "Workers of all lands, unite."

Such an attitude towards internationalism would be understandable in a Ramsay

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MacDonald or a Frank Hodges. They had other fish to fry. But it should not have appeared in the *Daily Herald:* for it cuts at the roots of the labour movement.

The *Daily Herald* has also distinguished itself by a venomous attack on the integrity of the Executive Committee of the Miners' Federation. It suggested they had decided to support affiliation against the wishes of their members. This slander is not only unwarranted in itself, but shows the length to which prejudice will drive previously moderate-minded writers. I wish some of them had half the hatred of Fascism which they display against Communist affiliation.

Whosoever on the Labour Party Executive thought up the Anti-Comintern argument may be extremely clever writers, but their connection with the trade union struggle was not strong enough to make them realise that they were hacking away at the whole international basis of the movement.

Nor were they quick-witted enough to see that their argument had been anticipated by Goebbels and Ribbentrop years ago. When Ribbentrop, at Hitler's orders, drew up the Anti-Comintern Pact nearly seven years ago, he was devising an infernal machine for blowing up unity within the democratic countries. He succeeded to some extent, as witness Quisling and Petain and de Man. But the moment that this became the key argument of Hitler and Ribbentrop, it should have been a warning to every democrat and a danger-signal for every trade unionist.

There is still time before the Conference at Whitsun to repair the damage that has been done to national unity through prejudiced and reckless arguments. There is still time to strengthen the unity of the working-class movement and so to build up national unity. But it depends on full discussion on every Trade Union branch and Executive.

In recent years it has fallen to me to speak on the wireless to miners in every part of the world, to Russians and Americans, to German and French and Australians. All these speeches are on record. My plea always has been for the utmost force to be used against Fascism through unity in each country. How can I appeal over the wireless to German miners or German workers to unite against Hitler if we cannot have unity at home?

All the miners want now is to have that same unity in the political as exists in the industrial movement. The Miners' Federation has shown in these war years that matterless of views, whether extreme Right or extreme Left, it has been able, without insisting on anyone kneeling on a penitential stool, to reach agreement and unity.

[*Our readers will be interested in the following letters, which show the present stage of what has been a long correspondence.*]

April 14, 1943.

The Minister of Information,
Malet Street, W.C.1.

Dear Sir,

I am instructed by my Editorial Board once more to request you to be good enough to give consideration to an application that our publication, LABOUR MONTHLY, be removed from the list of periodicals which may not be sent abroad except under Special Permit; or alternatively, that such a Permit be issued.

Yours faithfully,
MURIEL McDIARMID,
Manager.

Ministry of Information,
Malet Street,
London, W.C.1.
April 15, 1943.

Dear Madam,

I am directed to acknowledge your letter of the 14th April addressed to the Minister of Information and to say that the question of removing the export ban on the LABOUR MONTHLY is still under consideration and a decision may be expected in the near future.

Yours faithfully,
GEORGE P. THOMSON,
Rear-Admiral.
Chief Press Censor.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Symposium on Affiliation

[In view of the keen discussion throughout the labour movement on the application of the Communist Party for affiliation to the Labour Party, we print contributions below received from leading trade unionists.—ED. L.M.]

PERCY ALLOTT

IF it were not for some of the misguided professing Socialists and Trade Unionists in leading positions in the British Labour Movement, who "have eyes but they see not and ears but they cannot hear," in all probability there would be no global war to-day, but instead of the workers writing history in blood and tears in defence of the liberty of the weak and oppressed, we might have been engaged, in co-operation with Russia and our other Allies, in cultivating the arts of peace.

When one visualises the blind prejudices of such heresy hunters, who are more in agreement with the organised opponents of the working classes than with their Communist comrades who are fighting to preserve freedom of thought and speech, and who bask in the sunshine of the *Daily Telegraph*, which recently complimented the Labour Party Executive on its "sagacious appreciation" in rejecting Communist affiliation, one is tempted to utter the despairing cry of Macbeth that life is "a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing;" and to give up all hope of achieving the unity which is essential to win this war for the destruction of Fascism and Nazism and to deal with the economic problems of the war and the peace.

An entire race is being systematically tortured and exterminated by "pure-blooded Aryan" Nazi gangsters—"In Europe is a voice heard—lamentation and weeping; Rachel mourning for her children will not be comforted." The scorched earth of Russia and the blood-spattered stones of the devastated villages and cities of Belgium, Czecho-Slovakia, France and Greece—the ruined homes and desolated lives of the workers of Athens, Belgrade, Prague, Rotterdam, Kharkoff, Leningrad, Stalingrad and all the occupied countries cry aloud for vengeance and for unity of the organised workers of the world to ensure that civilisation does not perish from the earth. But at a time when the fate of civilisation hangs in the balance the Labour Party Executive refuse Communist consultation and decide to recommend to the Labour Party Conference that they should continue to manacle the mind of British Labour. They are apparently more concerned in heresy hunting and banning Communists who are helping to save civilisation than in destroying the anti-Semitic Fascist and Nazi enslavers of Europe.

The Communists, whom the Labour Party Executive refuse to recognise though they stood aside like the Priest and Levite whilst these "subversive Bolshevists" fought and died to crush the Italian and German Fascist hordes in Spain and though they are still willing to "pass by on the other side" whilst Russian Communists act as a human barrier to stem the torrential tide of Nazi oppression and to endure climatic rigours in stoical agony that WE may live; have always idealised peace and life. They *glorify life* to such an extent that they are willing to suffer torture, hunger and death in their millions that the world "may have life and that more abundantly."

This practical application of scientific Communism has caused "even the ranks of Tuscany to cheer!" Here is a tribute by one of the greatest Trade Union ambassadors, administrators and negotiators in this or any country: speaking to a resolution on the "International Situation" he said:—

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The resolution pledges the *maximum help* which our country can give the Russian people in this great struggle. They have shown themselves by the sacrifices they are making worthy of anything we can do to help them. A country which, having passed through the throes of revolution, through a period of extensive famine, grappling with forces from the outside world which sought to restrain at every point the great Socialist experiment which was taking place, a country which has the advantage of enormous new industrial development, has shown that even the achievements of the Five Year Plans may be at once thrown into the melting-pot, destroyed, perhaps for a generation, in the grim determination that they shall not be used by the invader. It may well be that the pages of history will show that the sacrifice of great undertakings like the Dnieper Dam and the enormous steel works, which were constructed by countless sacrifices on the part of the Russian people, measured against the burning of Moscow one hundred years ago, transcend anything which a nation has done to prove its determination to resist to the end.

Thus spoke Sir Walter Citrine, K.B.E., at the Trades Union Congress at Edinburgh in 1941.

How can we render "*maximum help*" to our Russian Allies if our own Labour ranks are disunited and if we refuse to affiliate with our British comrades who are imbued with the dynamic political faith and moral purpose of Marx, Lenin and Stalin, which have made these epic achievements possible?

If ever there was a time when the need existed to cast aside national bigotries and political prejudices and to rise superior to the old subservience, it is now. Before us lies the possibility of winning the war and the peace for the working people.

As Tom Quelch has well said:—

One Movement, one organised, persevering, aspiring Labour Movement, national and international, is, and must become increasingly, the great leader of history. The only Power that can rightly atrune the world to the mighty transforming process now in operation; that can assure the ordering of the social economy, make the coming peace permanent; appease the violence of the aftermath of war; satisfy the hungers and discontents of the peoples; direct the inevitable coming revolutions in Europe and elsewhere along the paths of achievement, away from the quagmires of terror, inflamed hatreds, wild vengeance, clandestine reprisals; carry through the immense tasks of social reconstruction—the only Power that can ensure that the great productive capacities of modern industrialism and the wonderful discoveries of modern science are used for the benefit of mankind—the only Power that can realise Socialism economically and socially and liberate humanity—is the Labour Movement.

Central Books Limited, distributors of Russian and progressive literature, who practise what they preach and pay Trade Union rates and equal wages for men and women, have increased their sales ten times since 1940 and their sale of Marxist classics in 1942 reached a value of £25,000. These facts indicate that the "Leaders" of the British Labour Movement are lagging far behind the rank and file. In vain do these modern Canutes command the surging tide of revolutionary progress to recede.

The economic, social, cultural and scientific achievements of the U.S.S.R. and the willingness of the Soviet peoples to sacrifice all they have built up so miraculously in one short generation of prodigious effort and unexampled self-denial, prove conclusively that if we sink our former political prejudices, share their faith and aspirations and march shoulder to shoulder, we can exterminate Fascism and build upon the ruins of the old, ugly world of hatred, engendered through political animosity and unregulated national and international economic competition, a new world of enduring peace and beauty, in our day and generation.

War or peace—beauty or ugliness—light or eternal darkness—liberty or slavery—life or death. The choice is ours and there is no time to lose. Time is *not* on our side. "The fault is not in our stars . . . but in ourselves, that we are underlings."

1943 BOUND VOLUMES.

READERS WHO WISH TO HAVE BOUND VOLUMES AT THE END OF THE YEAR SHOULD BE CAREFUL TO RETAIN THEIR OWN COPIES IN GOOD CONDITION, AS EXTRA COPIES WILL NOT BE AVAILABLE FOR THIS PURPOSE.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

D. F. SHARMAN, J.P.

Chairman, Cannock Divisional Labour Party
Vice-President, A.S.L.E. & F.

I HEREWITH submit my reasons for supporting the application of the Communist Party for affiliation to the Labour Party.

Let me commence by saying that first and foremost I am a Trade Unionist and a politician second. The majority of my working activities have been in the Trade Union movement, with other branches of the Labour and Socialist movement taking up what spare time was left.

What has this experience taught me? It has taught me that to make a success of any venture it is essential that you should have unity and all pull together.

I have, during my Trade Union activities, worked with members of the Communist Party, not only at the top but also at the bottom. I have never found a more loyal band to work with. True, at times we were not in complete agreement as to the policy to be pursued, but once the decision had been taken it was honourably observed by all. Is not this the true test? The sinking of the individual opinion and the acceptance of the majority decision.

This, therefore, raises the question of whether this loyalty would be less on the political question than on the question of Trade Union decisions. Personally, I don't think it will, I am confident that the same loyalty will be exhibited on the political field as on the industrial side.

The present position of the Labour Party sitting on the fence and refusing to co-operate with the Communist Party holds the whole movement up to ridicule. Wholehearted co-operation with our natural enemies, but a united Labour and Socialist movement—NO.

I do not in any way desire to suggest that in the present emergency that they should not work with the Conservative and Liberal Parties for the overwhelming defeat of Fascism. I believe that at the present time it is essential that all parties should be united in bringing this war to a successful conclusion.

What of the position after, when the danger has been removed? Will our capitalist friends still think we are jolly good fellows, will they continue to scratch the backs of Labour Members of Parliament, or was it the "writing on the wall" over the Catering Bill and the Beveridge Report? Is this an indication of the things to come? Personally, I believe it is. The privileged class will fight to keep things as they are. They will not give up easily the privileges that they have enjoyed all down the years.

To build up a "New Order" out of the chaos that will exist at the conclusion of hostilities will need a United Labour Movement. Therefore, I plump for affiliation to ensure that a "New Order" in accordance with the aspirations of the working-class shall emerge from the ruins caused by the present blood bath.

J. STANLEY

General Secretary, The Constructional Engineering Union

THIS question of unity, both nationally and internationally, should be simple to answer. What stands in the way? Vested interests; personal ambition; careerists; prejudice; or ——?

Let us study the Labour Party's attitude towards the Communist Party of Great Britain, and the reasons for refusing affiliation.

First, the Communist Party's allegiance to the Communist International. Surely it is not beyond the wit of the Labour Party to arrange accommodation for getting over this difficulty, apart alto-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gether from the undertaking given by the Communist Party to accept the Labour Party Constitution.

Again, the Labour Party mention the advantages affiliation would bring to the Communist Party. Isn't everybody agreed? Are the Labour Party afraid of the "small" bad wolf?

I have been a member of the I.L.P. and the Labour Party and hold no brief for the Communist Party; in fact, at times have fought them tooth and nail; but the need for co-ordinating all sections of the working-class movement, both nationally and internationally, is so great that we cannot afford isms and schisms.

We all admire Russia, and given the time to expand since their revolution, as we had since our revolution, who is to gainsay that her advance would be far greater than ours?

There is a strong and powerful Communist element in every country, and if it is for the benefit of the many as against the few should be harnessed.

We don't only want friendship with the U.S.S.R., we want that bond of alliance that we feel, if genuine, could guarantee security to most peoples.

After this war is over and won, Communism is bound to speak if we are to eliminate the present capitalist society.

I wonder sometimes if the oft-repeated phrase of the Labour Party, "State Control," is genuine, or has the passing of time and taste of office altered this one-time revolutionary idea?

What is the alternative to affiliation? Do we require in this country the present party system, or several progressive parties fighting each other, thereby perpetuating the reactionary party that the working-class has been fighting for centuries?

Let the Labour Party lead the way to solidarity; have sufficient faith in its own policy and power to cement all one-time critical elements; prove that this policy differs in little respect to other progressive policies, and thereby pave the way to the attainment of that peace and security so desirable.

Individuals shouldn't count.

T. SCRAFTON

General Secretary, The Prudential Staff Union

TWO things in these days must predominate in the mind and energies of organised Labour—the successful conclusion of the war and the victory of the peace. To be victorious in both is vital to every worker. The machinery of war has linked men and women over the years of war and to-day all units have sunk individual points of view in consolidated action to conquering the aggressor nations. Despite differing ideals, one dominating thought has filled men and women with energy, that united effort of brain and brawn will assure victory. This victory is now within our grasp and provides an object lesson to organised Labour the world over.

It is right that men and women plan for post-war at this stage, and especially that organised Labour be ready with a united front to lead workers of the world in the difficult days ahead, days heralding the victory of war and the opening of the battle for the peace. Labour must not cease to look ahead.

If it was possible to stand still for six months when peace comes, in national and international activities, planning would be more simple, but life must go on and change made without cessation of life's activities. For Labour, reconstruction means attacking to see that the changes consequent with peace will be for the benefit of the community and not for the benefit of the few. To win the peace, many plans have been, are being and will be considered. The majority are pigeon-holed as suitable patterns to fit in with a post-war scheme of things.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I think it is necessary that organised Labour keep a good up-to-date index of this outpouring of thought and ideal by men and women whose energies in the main have resulted in benefit for the many and not the privileged few. We must see that these plans do not remain in Government pigeon-holes.

All are agreed that in the future a better system of organised life must operate. Those whose energies are devoted to the furtherance of the workers' cause can be under no illusion that post-war planning and the post-war world will have to be fought on the battlefield comprising Labour and capitalistic interests. A better post-war world will not be presented to the workers. It must be fought for under leaders filled with intensity and enthusiasm.

I believe a better workers' world can be borne from the travails of war if all workers are prepared to cast aside prejudice and present one solid united policy against forces which will be ready to drag life back to pre-war conditions and pre-war systems.

There is great need for examination by organised Labour preparatory to making an attack on the canker of indifference which lies in the heart of many workers, some indifferent because of the broken field in which the various organisations of workers operate. This vast army can be won if organised Labour can unitedly plan a post-war world of value and lasting strength and then go out to win it.

To assure this there is great need for organisations examining their method and approach to other organisations to see what debars a united and consolidated front. Before we can hope to enlist the co-operation of workers in other countries, a vital factor in post-war planning, we must set some outstanding example. This could be accomplished through a solid combined organised body of workers, units in thought but co-ordinated as one whole for the great job in hand. It is up to all workers' organisations, therefore, in my opinion, to examine their alliances internally and externally. Any part which would retard in any way the solid alliance of workers' interests should be cut away. The imperative need of to-day is the co-ordinating of the reconstructive ability of the energies in brain and brawn of the worker. To get solid action means wholehearted acceptance of the rules and regulations laid down through the Labour and Trade Union national organisations.

A solid national affiliation of all British Labour, co-ordinating and co-operating with the workers of the U.S.S.R. and U.S.A. could bring about a world fit for heroes to really live in.

Condemnation of each other does not provide solution. The past often is a damning factor when published without explanations, and where there is a past in some individual organisations concrete assurances by definite action are the only means to bring universal solidarity.

The forthcoming Annual Conference of the Labour Party is most important to all workers in the British Isles, and also to the workers of the world. It is possible that it will be the prelude to victory, the meeting before the complete annihilation of German hopes of world domination; therefore, the planning must be done with care, consideration and courage.

There is something for all organised workers to do now. Cut away the driftwood of prejudice attached to organisations, clear the decks of all that would debar a solid workers' alliance and herald during 1943 the definite operation in action of workers united.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ERNEST PARKER

Area Organiser in the Scottish Division of the National Union of Distributive and Allied Workers

AN allied victory will ensure the defeat of Nazism, but can we be quite sure that the same victory spells defeat for British Fascism? It would be a great mistake to assume that the defeat of Hitler will guarantee the defeat of the black forces of reaction here also. True it is, the disappearance of Nazism will be a severe blow to them, but the Fascists of this country will realise the position, perhaps even better than we do, and act accordingly. Reaction will fight with all the power at its disposal to see to it that Soviet ideas are not extended to this country.

The Labour and Trade Union movement is co-operating with the Government in the prosecution of the war. It is right that it should be so, but we must never forget that even before 1939 a war was being fought; a war that has been waged for generations; a war of a different kind, but none the less of supreme importance—the class war. Not for one moment must we allow ourselves to believe that this war has stopped because of the united efforts being made in the fight against Nazism. The class war is fundamental and we must never forget this, particularly when hostilities have drawn to a close. It is my firm belief that the labour movement must be strongly united at the end of the war in order to be able to meet the attacks which will be made by the reactionaries. Make no mistake, the ruling class of this country will fight with all its cunning and resourcefulness against the workers. It will try to make them believe that there is nothing to learn from the Soviet Union, where tremendous things were done during the war, but which were only accounted for by the fact that the Russian people are so different, and can make sacrifices and withstand the cruelty of dictatorship. Even astrologers will be dragged in to show that the happenings on the Eastern front were due to factors over which man has no control! They will fight against improved conditions for the workers, but will demand immediate reductions in income tax and surtax. The reaction to the Beveridge Report and the opposition shown to the Catering Bill are but two items showing quite clearly that the Tory party is still run by people who know the value of unity on a class basis.

It is because of the need to meet the forces of reaction by a united working-class movement that I favour the affiliation of the Communist Party to the Labour Party. I hope that this question will not be debated on what has happened in the past. It is far more important to look ahead. At the same time it would be a mistake to overlook the lessons which may be learned from past experiences, but to do this is not to indulge in recrimination. I believe that the Communist Party has made mistakes, some of them serious, but I would not care to have the job of defending everything that the Labour Party has done! If the will to secure unity is strong enough, then it can be secured, no matter what has happened in the past. Those who oppose affiliation must be prepared for more and more expulsions and heresy hunting.

If we can unite with the Tory Party to ensure victory over Nazism, surely we can unite our own forces to ensure victory in the fight for Socialism.

The scarcity of "LABOUR MONTHLY" has been particularly felt among our readers in the Forces. One airman writes: "Any copies which civilian readers could send on to us will be greatly appreciated." Therefore, we would make two suggestions to those who feel they can spare their copy when they have finished with it: (1) send it on to a friend in the Forces; or (2) send it to us here, marked "Please Forward," and we will post it on to where it will be very warmly welcomed.

Soldiers, sailors and airmen please note. When writing, please say whether you would like these used copies sent you regularly; if so, do not forget to let us know when you change your address.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Road to Labour Unity

III. Communism and the Labour Movement

by R. PALME DUTT

THE Communist Party of Great Britain has now been in existence for twenty-three years. It has grown out of the previous socialist movement in this country, in direct descent from the pioneer socialist organisation in Britain, the Social Democratic Federation, founded in the early eighties. During these twenty-three years it has grown from a handful of thousands to a party of 65,000 members, with an active role and influence in the mass organisations of the labour movement and the main centres of the industrial working-class, with some following among progressive professional and middle-class people, and, as the organ of Marxist opinion on the Left, playing a part in the political life of the country and in the formation of opinion in the labour movement.

Whatever the opinion of Communism, all objective observers will agree that Communism or Marxism now represents the outlook of an important and growing section of the working-class movement, especially among its younger members. It is a minority, but a growing minority; all prophecies of its early demise, repeated at regular intervals during this past quarter of a century, have been belied by its continuously increasing vitality and influence. Whether it will become the main trend of the labour movement in the future period, as Communists believe, only time will show. What is already clear, and forces itself on the recognition equally of friends and foes, is that, alike in policy and organisation, Communism is an integral part of the working-class movement of this country; a permanent and indestructible part; no surgical operation can root it out. These are facts which every serious socialist and member of the labour movement must necessarily take into account, in considering the future of the labour movement, independently of subjective opinions of approval or disapproval of Communism. If there is to be unity of the working-class in this country, that unity must include the Communist section of the working-class, with equal rights with other sections.

Communists, while sincerely expressing the viewpoint which they believe to be in the interests of the whole movement, do not want such a split or division. They believe that it is possible for the necessary development of opinion within the movement to take place harmoniously, by democratic discussion and decision, while maintaining the essential unity of action in every current situation. This is the possibility which is opened out by the method of affiliation of the Communist Party to the Labour Party. Such a path of development is equally in the interests of all sections, whether friendly or opposed to Communism.

* * * * *

The reasoned case for the acceptance of affiliation has been presented in the previous two articles on the grounds of:—

(1) The urgent needs of the present situation, making imperative unity of the labour movement, both for victory over Fascism, and for advance after the war.

(2) The traditional character and development of the Labour Party as the federal union of all working-class organisations recognising the common socialist aim, and the harmful consequences of recent disruptive policies departing from the original basis of the Labour Party.

What stands in the way? What are the opposing arguments? Can any comparable serious case be argued against it?

Small light will be thrown on the answer to this question by the successive statements issued in the name of the Labour Party Executive majority or by the editorial statements of the official Labour organ. Detached observers have noted that these statements have deteriorated, as the controversy has pro-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ceeded, beginning from, at any rate, an argued case, even if on a very narrow legalist constitutional point of the interpretation of Statutes and Rules, without any attempt at a political outlook, or recognition of the existence of the war, Fascism or any other concrete reality of the world we have to face; but rapidly passing over to increasingly shrill and violent abuse ("dishonest," "contemptible," "disruptive," "irresponsible men with no loyalty to this country," "money-power wielded secretly," "deceit and betrayal" "hypocrisy and irresponsibility," "hypocrisy and betrayal," "cynical, opportunist and dishonest," etc., etc.) recalling the worst excesses of the similar previous propaganda against Stalin as the "Red Tsar," "criminal gangster," "Soviet imperialism," "Communazis," Mannerheim and Tanner as apostles of democracy, and similar outbursts of which all members of the Labour Party are to-day justly ashamed.

Prejudice, although no argument, can under certain conditions be a powerful political force. Prejudice against Communism and the Communist Party has been built up by the entire capitalist press during the past quarter of a century through a ceaseless campaign of envenomed attacks and calumnies with a daily repetition reaching tens of millions against the tiny handful reached by statements of Communists on their own behalf. The attempt of the opponents of affiliation to meet the proposals of the Communists for a united labour movement by general denunciations of Communists, denying their honesty or the sincerity of their desire to serve the labour movement, and presenting them in melodramatic fashion as a mysterious, alien, subversive force, plotting and scheming to destroy the labour movement, is a fantastic picture to those who know the facts; but it is an attempt to build on the foundations of prejudice laid by decades of capitalist propaganda. Serious members of the labour movement need, therefore, to be on their guard against this kind of approach, or poisoning of the wells of rational controversy on a critical issue for the whole future of the movement.

* * * * *

What, then, are the misconceptions, doubts, difficulties, hesitations or prejudice against Communism and the Communist Party, which are felt as an obstacle to affiliation; that is, as an obstacle to the co-operation of the Communist Party in a united labour movement?

Insofar as these are sincerely felt by many members of the Labour Party, or raised by opponents, they may be summarised as follows:—

(1) Why should there be a Communist Party? Is not the Labour Party enough? Why should the Marxist workers form a special organisation, and demand its affiliation with equal rights in the federation of the Labour Party? Why should they not be satisfied to disband their organisation and apply for admission as individual members of the Labour Party?

(2) Is not the programme and policy of the Communist Party fundamentally opposed to the programme and policy of the Labour Party?

(3) Is not the international affiliation of the Communist Party, with its recognition of binding international obligations, an obstacle to the fulfilment of its obligations as an affiliated section of the Labour Party?

(4) Is not the Communist Party a "tool of Moscow," serving the interests of the Soviet Union, and not the interests of the British working-class and British people?

(5) Does not the unparalleled political activity of the Communist Party, and its extensive publications, prove that there must be some sinister source of financial support other than the support of its members and sympathisers in Britain?

(6) Do not the changes of policy and tactics of the Communist Party in response to different situations, especially in relation to the varying stages of the war, prove its instability, that it is serving alien interests, and not the interests of the British people, and that it would therefore be an untrustworthy partner in a united labour movement.

These are the charges or queries, as fairly as they can be summarised, whether serious or fantastic.

It is obvious that to deal with the deep bog of misunderstanding here revealed adequately—not with debating answers—would require a volume; since they involve the whole understanding of Marx-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ism and Leninism; of the development and experience of the international labour movement, and of the movement in Britain, and of the strategy and tactics of the labour movement. Every one of these queries could become the theme of a richly instructive analysis.

For present purposes, our approach must be more modest. We are not interested in debating answers, but in a genuine understanding of the issues, which are vital for the future of working-class liberation in Britain. Some preliminary attempt must therefore be made, not yet to deal fully with the issues, but to seek to promote better understanding between Communists and non-Communists in our common movement, so as to ease the way for the urgently necessary present co-operation, by endeavouring to explain a little, however inadequately, what Communism stands for, what Communists are striving for, why they have built up their organisation, how they are seeking to serve the common interests of the labour movement. Communists are a serious and hard-working section of the working-class movement. Many have been through a hard school, have had to face many hardships and sacrifices for what they believe in, even though not yet a fraction of what many Communists in other countries have faced and are facing. They are fallible, make mistakes, and openly and publicly criticise and correct their mistakes. But they have only one aim, to serve the interests of the whole labour movement.

* * * * *

Communism, or Marxism, has always been the special target of attack of the enemies of the labour movement. Nearly a century has passed since the first "Manifesto of the Communist Party" declared how "all the powers of old Europe" had entered into "a holy alliance" against Communism: "Pope and Tsar, Metternich and Guizot, French Radicals and German police-spies"—or, as we might say to-day, "Pope and Mikado, Hitler and Mussolini, Laval and the Gestapo."

Where is the party in opposition that has not been decried as communistic by its opponents in power? Where is the opposition that has not hurled back the branding reproach of Communism against the more advanced opposition parties, as well as against its reactionary adversaries?

The picture has not yet changed in this essential character through a whole century of advancing strength of Communism. Against this background of a century of continuous struggle and development, it must be obvious to the most superficial observer that the attempt to treat Communism as a "conspiracy" of "Moscow" is senseless reactionary claptrap.

Fascism to-day and the Hitlerite "New Order" in Europe directs its main fire against Marxism, Communism and the Communist International—thereby recognising in Communism the most implacable enemy of their barbarous system, and the shock-troops of popular liberation. The Tripartite Pact or Axis Fascist Alliance is organised in the guise of "the Anti-Comintern Pact." These are facts which carry an inescapable lesson for other sections of the labour movement. They mean that Fascism and all the reactionary forces which seek to destroy the labour movement and democracy see in Communism the main enemy, their most conscious, clear-sighted and irreconcilable antagonist, the key citadel to be stormed; they calculate that, if they can storm this citadel, the path to the conquest of the rest of the labour movement will be easy. The plain strategical conclusion for all other sections of the labour movement is obvious, whatever their subjective opinions of Communism. Their interests lie in closest unity with Communism against the forces of reaction.

This lesson is especially important to-day, when the entire Nazi propaganda machine is striving to split the coalition of the United Nations by raising the cry "against Communism," "against the Communist International." To echo this propaganda at this moment, to seek to sow hostility among other sections of the labour movement against Communism and against the Communist International,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is to play Hitler's game. The "anti-Comintern" cry is Hitler's trap for the labour movement.

* * * * *

Communism has thus been, and is, an integral part of the working-class movement in all countries where there is a working-class movement. The organised Communist movement has developed for over a century, from a time when there was not yet a working-class movement in Russia. The experience of the first victorious working-class revolution has powerfully strengthened the theory and practice of Communism. But Communism is not the product of the Russian Revolution or the Soviet Union. On the contrary, the leadership of Communism, developing already for three-quarters of a century, made possible the victory of the Russian Revolution and the establishment of Socialism in the Soviet Union.

The classic document and foundation programme of Communism, the "Manifesto of the Communist Party," by Marx and Engels, was originally published in London in the beginning of 1848, and remains to-day, despite the passage of ninety-five years, the clearest introductory statement. In this Manifesto, issued on behalf of the International Communist League (predecessor of the Communist International), Marx and Engels explained the world outlook and aims of Communism; laid bare the development of class-society, and the rise and future downfall of capitalism; and showed the task of the working-class to conquer political power and organise social production.

Marx and Engels made clear the necessity of a political party of the working class, "a class-conscious class-party," as indispensable for the conquest of political power:—

> For the proletariat to be strong enough to conquer on the day of decision, it is necessary, and this view Marx and I have upheld since 1847, that it should form its own party, separated from all others and opposed to them, a class-conscious class-party.
>
> —(Engels, letter to Trier, 1889.)

At the same time Marx and Engels made clear that the Communist Party, while opposed to all class interests and organisations antagonistic to the interests of the working class, is not separate from or opposed to the rest of the organised working class movement. In the "Manifesto of the Communist Party" they dealt with the question of the relation of the Communists to other sections of the working-class movement:—

> They have no interests separate and apart from those of the proletariat as a whole.
>
> They do not set up any sectarian principles of their own, by which to shape and mould the proletarian movement. . . .
>
> The Communists are distinguished from the other working-class parties by this only: 1. In the national struggles of the proletarians of the different countries, they point out and bring to the front the common interests of the entire proletariat, independently of all nationality. 2. In the various stages of development which the struggle of the working-class against the bourgeoisie has to pass through, they always and everywhere represent the interests of the movement as a whole. . . .
>
> The Communists fight for the attainment of the immediate aims, for the enforcement of the momentary interests of the working class; but in the movement of the present, they also represent and take care of the future of that movement.

Thus the distinguishing principles of the Communist Party are here set out as:—

(1) Internationalism—not in contradiction to the interests of the working-class movement within each country, but as the true expression of the interests of the working-class movement within each country.

(2) Representation of the permanent common interests of "the movement as a whole."

If these principles are carefully considered, it will be seen how, in the concrete historical conditions of the present stage of the movement in Britain, the proposal of affiliation of the Communist Party to the Labour Party represents an exceptionally favourable method for the realisation of these basic aims, for the common good of both parties, that is, both for the constructive rôle of the Communist Party as a loyal collaborator in the broad labour movement and for the strengthening of the Labour Party and advance of the whole movement, with the ultimate perspective of the single class-party.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For this conception of a stage of development of a broad united movement, embracing many differing tendencies (corresponding to the still incomplete development of the working-class movement) with Communism as a loyal collaborator, seeking to assist the development of the movement through united action and discussion, it is of interest to compare what Engels had to say in his 1890 Preface to the Manifesto about the experience of the First International:—

> Its aim (of the International Working Men's Association) was to weld together into *one* huge army the whole militant working-class of Europe and America. Therefore, it could not *set out* from the principles laid down in the Manifesto. It was bound to have a programme which would not shut the door on the English Trade Unions, the French, Belgian, Italian and Spanish Proudhonists and the German Lassalleans. This programme —the considerations underlying the Statutes of the International—was drawn up by Marx with a master hand acknowledged even by Bakunin and the anarchists. For the ultimate final triumph of the ideas set forth in the Manifesto, Marx relied solely upon the intellectual development of the working-class, as it necessarily had to ensue from united action and discussion.

* * * * * *

On the basis of this century of development of Communism all over the world, embodying the experience of the working-class movement in all countries, the Communist International has grown up. The Communist International unites the Communist Parties of the world in a democratic self-governing voluntary association for the purpose of unifying the struggle of the international working class against world capital. It is the only international working-class organisation in the world to-day which has proved its capacity of survival and continuous vitality through all the storms of our epoch, at a time when all other more limited and partial attempts, reaching in any case to only a few countries or regions during their short-lived existence, have shipwrecked in the test of practice. It is the only international working-class organisation in history which has for the first time reached to every country in the world, without distinction of nation, race or colour, thus realising the dearest dream of every socialist pioneer. Such an achievement of the international working class is a proud achievement, of enormous practical value in the confusions and dispersions of our time, and a powerful instrument on the side of freedom, progress and socialism in the future tasks of world reconstruction.

The Communist International is the outcome, the stage reached in our day, of the continuous effort of working class internationalism, through decades of development, from the International Communist League of the eighteen-forties, through the First International of 1864-76, and the Second International of 1889-1914.

The International Communist League of a century ago established the platform of Marxism as the foundation of modern socialism and of the international working-class movement.

The First International, or International Working Men's Association of 1864-76, laid the foundation of the international organisation of the workers. It was a training-ground in international working-class action, and the battleground within which Marxism established its leadership in the working-class movement.

The Second International of 1889-1914 fulfilled the task of building broad mass parties of the working class in the leading countries on the basis of acceptance of the platform of Marxism. But the new problems of the imperialist era, bringing revolutionary tasks, proved the inadequacy of the Second International. The influence of imperialism increasingly penetrated its ranks, especially the leading circles, and led to reformism, legalist illusions and retreat from the working-class struggle. As the example of Bolshevism showed, new types of revolutionary Marxist mass parties were required to meet the tasks of the imperialist era, confront the concentrated power of monopoly capital, establish international unity of action, and lead the working class, at the head of all sections of the masses of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people, to the conquest of power. Unable to fulfil these tasks, and corroded with inner degeneration and the retreat from Marxism, the Second International fell to pieces with the stern test of the war of 1914.

The Communist International developed from the collapse of the old Second International, the experience of the war of 1914-18, and the world revolutionary advance to which it gave rise, in order to carry forward the international working class movement in the new era, and fulfil the tasks which the old Second International had begun, but proved unable to accomplish. Developing from the International Socialist Commission established at the Zimmerwald International Conference in 1915, the First Congress of the Communist International was held in March, 1919.

The Communist International, embodying the experiences and lessons of the First and Second Internationals, united the main effective forces of the old Second International. Alongside the Russian Communist Party, leading the united Russian working-class movement, the French Socialist Party, the single party of the French working class, joined the Communist International by an overwhelming majority vote; the Italian Socialist Party joined the Communist International by a unanimous decision; the main forces of the German Socialist movement, apart from the Kaiser-Socialists (*i.e.*, the German Independent Socialist Party, with half a million members, by an overwhelming majority vote, uniting with the Spartacus League) joined the Communist International; the majority of the American Socialist Party joined the Communist International. The exceptional position in Britain alone among leading countries reflected the slower development in Britain, where the Labour Party had only been admitted to the Second International a few years before the collapse of 1914.

The Communist International is thus no "Russian appendage," but the heir of the century-old international socialist movement.

At the same time the representative of those tendencies within the labour movement which had abandoned the basis of Marxism and the class struggle, and which sought to follow the path of co-operation with imperialism, as the supposed path of peaceful progress, founded the "Labour and Socialist International" (established at Hamburg in 1923 by the amalgamation of two previous groupings). The experience of the modern era led to the speedy collapse of this organisation as an international organisation, as its founders had to recognise:—

> The basic principles of the international organisation established at the initial Congress of Hamburg have become untenable. . . . The attempt to reconstruct the International, to which I devoted my work, has temporarily failed.
>
> (F. Adler, Secretary of the Labour and Socialist International, 1923-39, Memorandum to the Executive of the L.S.I., June, 1939.)

The way must and will be found in the coming years to heal the split and lead forward to a fully effective united International. The establishment of unity in Britain will be a powerful contribution to this aim.

* * * * *

The Constitution of the Communist International reflected the determination of the class-conscious workers all over the world to overcome the weaknesses of the old Second International which had led to its collapse in 1914. Hence the fully clear Marxist-Leninist basis of its theory and practice. Hence also the insistence on a centralised International, with full recognition of international obligations and discipline.

All international socialists without exception have always recognised the necessity of such a centralised International, and especially since 1914, have placed their finger on the unclearness of the Constitution of the old Second International in this respect as one of the cardinal weaknesses leading to its downfall.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In principle the Constitution of the Labour and Socialist International, to which the Labour Party is affiliated, recognises the same rule of the binding character of international decisions for all national sections:—

Clause 3: The Labour and Socialist International can only become a reality if its decisions in all international questions are binding on its affiliated bodies. The resolutions of the International will therefore imply a self-imposed limitation of the autonomy of the affiliated organisations.

Yet it has never been suggested that the Labour Party, by its affiliation to the Labour and Socialist International, and consequent acceptance of binding decisions of a higher body in which it has only minority representation, has thereby ceased to be a democratic self-governing party.

The Statutes and Rules of the Communist International are so drawn up as to make absolutely certain, beyond the possibility of doubt or dispute, that the fatal weakness of the old Second International shall not be repeated, and that the authority of the International shall be absolute and sovereign and recognised by all national sections. This is the essential principle of a centralised International, which is recognised by all international socialists. The only alternative is "National Socialism," *i.e.*, Nazism.

But does this acceptance of binding international obligations by the Communist Party constitute an obstacle to its affiliation to the Labour Party? Does it mean a "dual loyalty," preventing the Communist Party from fulfilling its obligations as an affiliated section of the Labour Party? This is the question raised by the Labour Party Executive. This is the main argument which the Labour Party Executive majority stresses in order to influence opinion in the trade unions and local parties against acceptance of the affiliation of the Communist Party.

The Labour Party Executive quotes the Statutes and Rules of the Communist International in order to prove:—

(1) That the Communist Party cannot be regarded as a democratic self-governing body, in view of its acceptance of binding international obligations;

(2) that the Communist Party is therefore not "free" to fulfil its obligations as an affiliated section of the Labour Party, even though it has officially pledged itself to do so.

The first argument falls to the ground, in view of the fact that the Labour Party is also constitutionally bound, by its affiliation to the Labour and Socialist International, by binding international obligations, to obey decisions of a higher body in which it is a minority, and yet does not regard this as annulling its democratic self-governing character. The acceptance of a higher international authority is an integral characteristic of every working-class socialist organisation, and is no contradiction to its democratic self-governing character.

What of the second argument, implying an inevitable "conflict of loyalties," such that the Communist Party would be unable to fulfil its obligations as an affiliated section of the Labour Party?

This argument is based on a narrow legalistic interpretation of the Statutes and Rules, with complete blindness to the historical and political conditions which have given rise to them and govern their application. In much the same way a lawyer, without understanding of the working-class movement, could examine from outside the rules of a trade union, the principles of the "closed shop" or 100 per cent. trade unionism, and deduce therefrom a system of "tyranny" over the individual worker, whereas to the working-class movement these same principles are pillars of working-class freedom of organisation and action. The conflict between these two viewpoints cannot be settled on narrow legalistic grounds, without consideration of political realities. The legalistic argument appears to its own advocates impregnable—but it has

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no political validity for the working-class movement.*

The Statutes and Rules of the Communist International can only be understood in the light of the politics of Marxism, which govern their application. In form, the authority of the International is absolute and unlimited—as it must be. Hence the lawyer can deduce all the possibilities of "inevitable future conflict" and reach his triumphant negative conclusion; because for him the paramount reality of a common class interest has no existence; he sees only formulas on paper. But in practice the Statutes and Rules of the Communist International are operated on the basis of the political outlook of Marxism, *i.e.*, the understanding that the working-class movement in each country must develop according to the special conditions prevailing in that country, that there can be no question of "imposing" any policy by "orders" from outside against the conviction of those concerned, that the movement in each country must develop under its own responsible leadership, making its own decisions, making its own mistakes, and learning by its mistakes and experience, and that therefore the aim of international unity of action, towards which all socialists and class-conscious workers correctly strive, must be combined with the responsible self-governing development of each national movement. All this is elementary; but it is not written in rule-books, and is therefore invisible to lawyers, although easily understandable to socialists and organised workers. Once it is understood, the whole "insoluble problem" falls to the ground. The supposed mountain of difficulty is a molehill.

The entire policy of the Communist International, as laid down by its Seventh World Congress in 1935, is directed towards promoting working-class unity in every country. The experience of co-operation in France, in Spain and a series of other countries, has shown how faithfully and loyally the Communists have carried out such co-operation. The achievement of working class unity in Britain, by the affiliation of the Communist Party to the Labour Party, would be the greatest victory of unity in any country in the world, and would open up a glowing prospect for the international working class movement. Is it not obvious common sense that the Communists in Britain, as internationally, would do everything in their power to make such unity a success, to prevent any possible source of difficulty which could hinder its fulfilment, and to ensure its maintenance within the conditions of the understanding reached, that is, within the conditions of the affiliation of the Communist Party to the Labour Party and the fulfilment of all obligations undertaken? This is the straightforward political answer to the legalistic difficulty raised.

* * * * *

So far, we have dealt with the principles and development of Communism in general, and of the Communist International, on which so many misconceptions are still current. It is necessary to come, finally, to the questions affecting especially the Communist Party of Great Britain.

The Communist Party of Great Britain was founded in 1920 by the unification of the British Socialist Party with other smaller socialist groups, drawing in the

* A further example may illustrate this. A number of members of the Labour Party Executive and leadership are also members of the Privy Council, bound by the Privy Councillor's oath. There is here a formal legal "conflict of loyalties," which may give rise to actual conflict in practice. There is more positive ground for anticipating future conflict, since the conflict is between rival class loyalties, and not of two organisations of the common working class movement, representing parallel aims. Yet in practice no burning issue arises from this at the moment in the Labour Party. The scribes and pharisees who are raised to such a pitch of excitement over the Statutes and Rules of the Communist International find no cause for concern over this contradiction of dual loyalties. Why? Because in practice no political question arises at present in this connection. The mass of the membership of the Labour Party are satisfied to judge this question in a realist political fashion, and not on the basis of the microscopic examination of legal formulas.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

main leading forces of the shop stewards' movement which had been the spearhead of the militant working class during the war years. From its foundation the Communist Party applied for affiliation to the Labour Party, thus expressing its understanding of the role of Communism in relation to the broad labour movement.

The foundation of the Communist Party represented an important step towards the goal of unity of the British labour movement. In place of the former warring sects of the militant workers, sniping at one another, isolated from the masses, and often confusing the fight against reformism with hostility to the Labour Party and to official trade unionism as a whole, there was now established a unified organisation, based on a deeper understanding of Marxism, determined to overcome the old sectarian faults, and seeking to fulfil the constructive role of Marxism in relation to the broad labour movement along the path of affiliation to the Labour Party.

Thus the foundation of the Communist Party was not a splitting movement; on the contrary, it was a movement of unification, and the first step to overcoming many splits inherited from the past. It was not a sectarian movement; on the contrary, it was the expression of the fight against the old sectarian tendencies on the Left. It was not a breakaway from the Labour Party; on the contrary, the main constituent organisation on which it was built, the British Socialist Party, was already affiliated to the Labour Party, and remained affiliated to the Labour Party without question, after joining the Communist International; what was new was that many virile militant elements on the Left, previously hostile to parliamentarism and to any link-up with the Labour Party, were now won over to support the policy of affiliation to the Labour Party. The split only came when the Labour Party rejected the affiliation of the Communist Party.

At the outset, therefore, the formation of the Communist Party opened the way for the first time to the full unification of the labour movement in Britain, with the ending of the old sectarianism on the Left and its replacement by a responsible Marxist Left wing, playing its part in the broad movement and in the Labour Party, for the common advance to the goal of socialism. Unfortunately, that opportunity was not taken. The dominant influence of the basically anti-Labour MacDonald leading group in the Labour Party at that time, with the support of the Independent Labour Party, succeeded in securing the rejection of the application for affiliation of the Communist Party, and thus barred the road to unity, preparing the ground for the subsequently widening system of bans and exclusions. It should be freely recognised that many tactical faults of the early Communist Party, which had far from shed all the old sectarian tendencies in the first stages, played into the hands of the enemies of unity.

Had the affiliation of the Communist Party been accepted twenty years ago, the subsequent history of the British labour movement would have been different, and we should certainly have had more positive results to show for the past twenty years of the labour movement in this country.

To-day the opportunity recurs, with deeper experience on both sides, to correct the error of twenty years ago, and to achieve unity at a far more advanced and critical stage of the movement. It is for us to see that this opportunity is taken.

[*The remainder of this section deals with special questions raised concerning the Communist Party of Great Britain. Space prevents the inclusion of these concluding portions in the present issue of* LABOUR MONTHLY; *but the whole, including the preceding articles, with important additions, is available for readers in the pamphlet, "The Road to Labour Unity," now on sale.*]

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Stirrings in Ireland

by WILLIAM RUST

IF the British ruling circles which in 1921 so triumphantly produced partition as the solution of the Irish question could have foreseen the fruits of this policy during the period of the war against Fascism, even such hardened imperialists might have been dismayed at the results of their own handiwork. To this day Ireland remains economically weak and politically divided; the South is neutral, and the North, although belligerent, is only half in the war.

By reason of the talents of its people, its economic resources and its geographical position Ireland could play a significant part in the war; its harbours would be of great aid to shipping and to the war against the U-boats. On the other hand, in any extension of the German offensive in the West and against Britain there is no doubt that the Nazis would attempt to draw Ireland into the sphere of military operations. The Nazis, although they derive benefits from Irish neutrality, would certainly not hesitate to use Ireland as a base of operations if it suited their purposes.

At one stage of the war the question of Anglo-Irish relations was the subject of active controversy, but it now seems of little interest to press and public in Britain. This stagnation, probably due to the unwillingness of all three Governments involved to handle a thorny subject, conceals a number of important changes that are taking place in the outlook of the Irish people under the influence of the worsening economic situation internally, of world events and the mighty, heroic role of the Soviet Union.

The attitude of Northern Ireland to the war has changed considerably since the days when Churchill decided that it was impolitic to impose conscription there. This is principally due to the anti-Fascist sentiments of the organised workers and the influence exerted by the Communist Party of Ireland, whose policy is put forward with great vigour and ability. In fact, the biggest and most enthusiastic political meetings held in Belfast are those organised by the Communist Party, which has secured a strong following amongst the industrial workers and in the trade unions. Belfast politics are notoriously embittered and sectarian. It is therefore of great significance that the Communists are able to play such a unifying role, placing the realities of the war before the people and influencing also the advanced Nationalist elements.

This work is carried on effectively despite various handicaps imposed by the authorities at Westminster and Stormont. No licence can be obtained for a weekly organ and the Party therefore has to rely on its duplicated paper, *Unity*, which makes very good use of its limited space. Working class speakers from Britain are in big demand, but getting through to Belfast is somewhat akin to storming a fortress. Also, the export ban excludes such journals as the LABOUR MONTHLY and *The Challenge*. The circulation of the *Daily Worker* is permitted, and despite the fact that it arrives a day late is eagerly read and discussed. Looked upon as a link with the mass movement in Britain and as a source of reliable news about the Soviet Union and the international working class, the *Daily Worker* is regarded with deep affection by the Belfast workers.

This greatly increased activity of the Communist Party is also a reflection of the advance of the labour movement, to be observed in the South as well as the North. But this advance has yet to reach the point where the leaders of the two Labour Parties are prepared to face up to all the vital issues of the day and to give a clear lead on the war. The Eire Labour Party tries to out-neutral De Valera and aims at winning support mainly on the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

basis of its social programme; it is likely to gain very big support in the General Election scheduled for June. The increasing support for the Northern Ireland Labour Party was evidenced by Jack Beattie's sensational victory at Belfast West, where he won the Westminster seat from a Unionist. It is significant, however, that Beattie excluded the question of the war from his election campaign.

If the Labour Party were to accept all of the implications of its support for the war and to take the lead for the formation of a united government in Northern Ireland it would be able to effect a radical change in the situation. The petrification of the present Government, composed of the Unionist Old Guard to whom the preservation of the frontier is the be-all and end-all of existence, is the greatest barrier to progress in the Six Counties.

The people of Northern Ireland are in the unhappy position of having two Governments, of which the nearer is inept and the further indifferent. The result is that, apart from the current Ministry of Information propaganda, nothing is done officially to rescue the Six Counties from half-heartedness and cynicism. Propaganda from the Ministry of Information about the urgency of the war effort certainly falls on stony ground in an area where there is no conscription, no work for more than twenty thousand people and no sign that the local government intends to do anything except to hold on to office.

And yet there is a very strong basis to build on. Despite national and religious differences, the Belfast workers represent a very strong force and whatever they turn to they do with will and determination. Now that the political soil has been effectively ploughed up by the Communist Party a strong unity lead, expressed through the co-operation of all parties opposed to Fascism and the formation of a united government at Stormont, would meet with a tremendous response.

But if the present situation is allowed to drift, if no steps are taken from Westminster to deal with the economic crisis the present favourable opportunities may quickly pass with depressing effects on the morale of the people.

The new mood of the Belfast workers also has a meaning for the South, where there is a stirring amongst the people because of the economic crisis and an inclination to turn to new ideas and to shake themselves out of the Isolationism, which is cutting them off from the world at large. The decision of the Belfast Trades Council to invite Jim Larkin up from Dublin for its united May Day demonstration is an important sign of the desire of the common people for Irish unity and the ending of the unnatural partition.

There is ample cause for anti-Fascists to be deeply concerned with the situation in Eire, especially in view of the activities of the Axis diplomats and the semi-Fascist propaganda carried on by allegedly cultural organisations.

Ailtiri na Aseirghe (Masons of the New Life) is openly Fascist. It advocates the corporative state, the banning of trade unions, the leadership principle, racial mythology, militarism and Ireland's world destiny. It is anti-British, anti-American and pro-German. It proposes Labour Corps, degradation of women to breeding and cooking, and is anti-Semitic.

The large majority for a motion in favour of a dictatorship for Ireland carried by the students at the Intervarsity Gaelic Debate and the citing of Portugal as a model for the Irish people to follow is an indication of the influence of a certain trend in the national movement. *Unity* commented on this trend as follows:—

> Political naivete and outmoded prejudices are probably responsible for the success of the resolution amongst the students. These students, we assume, wish to see an Ireland in which native culture will flourish, and yet by implication they sympathise with a regime that has attempted to destroy the national cultures of the countries now growing under its domination.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The extremely rigid and semi-dictatorial censorship, strongly influenced by the Catholic Church, has established a paralysing grip on the intellectual and political life of the country. The publication of articles and pamphlets favouring the cause of the United Nations is practically impossible and the import of anti-Fascist literature from Britain is forbidden. The policy of neutrality is glorified in such a way as if escape from the war were adequate compensation for all the hardships that the Irish people are at present undergoing, as if Ireland could remain permanently cut off from the world-wide struggle of humanity for freedom and humanity.

The great and stormy history of the Irish people and their record in all parts of the world is the guarantee of what great part they will be able to play once they take their rightful place in the fight against Fascism, is the guarantee that in the end they will shake themselves free from the wiles of the Nazi propagandists, that the day will come when the Dublin workers will assert their famous traditions and march forward in unity with their brothers of Belfast.

It is the task of the British workers to help in the hastening of that day, to stretch out the hand of friendship to the Irish people and to destroy the suspicion and hatred engendered by the centuries of imperialist misrule, which is the basic cause of Ireland's present difficult political and economic position.

There are many hopeful stirrings within Ireland, both North and South. A renewed attempt by the British Government to arrive at an understanding with Eire and the putting forward of a programme of economic co-operation would greatly assist the progressive forces and help to isolate the Axis elements. Downing Street also has an economic and political responsibility to the North which should be fulfilled without delay, even if the result is that certain decaying Ulster Diehards have to make way for young and vigorous representatives of the people.

The future of Ireland, its independence and national culture, is bound up with the victory of the United Nations. The fight for victory over Fascism is not just another of "Britain's wars," it is a comradeship of arms against the foe of all human progress and a comradeship in which a new unity of the British and Irish people can be forged for all time.

Indian Crisis

by BEN BRADLEY

Vice-President, All-India T.U.C. 1928-1929

THE Secretary of State for India, Mr. Amery, moved in Parliament on March 30, "That this House approves the continuance in force of the Proclamation issued under Section 93 of the Government of India Act, etc., etc. . . . ."

Mr. Amery in this motion was asking Parliament to sanction, for a further period, complete dictatorial powers for the Viceroy and Governors in India. It is true that in the opening remarks of his speech he said that "This and other motions on the order paper are concerned with only six out of the eleven Provinces of British India."

Here, then, Mr. Amery asks Parliament to give complete dictatorial powers to these six Governors and he tells the House that it is because of the attitude of the Congress that the Government was forced to take this step in 1939. In the other five provinces we are told there is self-government and that self-government will be resumed in the six provinces as soon as Ministers can be found in a position to conduct affairs.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What is this self-government in the five provinces with self-government? We had some insight into this "Self-Government" when the Premier of Sind was forced to resign some time ago.

The latest example is Bengal. On March 27, the Premier of Bengal resigned. On the afternoon of his resignation the Premier, Mr. Fazlul Huq, disclosed that his resignation was prompted by the Governor of Bengal in a ninety-minute talk in which the formation of a National Cabinet and other proposals were discussed. The Governor made some proposals which, Mr. Huq said, he could not accept consistently with self-government. "Despite what has happened," he said, "I maintain and am confident that I still enjoy the confidence of the majority of the House." Nevertheless, he was forced to resign by the Governor of Bengal.

There is therefore very little difference between rule through Emergency Powers and this type of "self-government."

It is strange, however, that Mr. Amery should, in his speech in the House, continue to talk of Congress Dictatorship. This comes ill from the lips of Amery while defending his types of dictatorship.

India, for the past nine months, since August 8, 1942, has been racked by the deepest political crisis. On August 9 Congress Leaders were arrested and the deadlock made complete. It seems, from the events during the intervening period, and by the character and tone of Mr. Amery's speech, that the Government are determined that the deadlock should remain. Yet, with the world locked in deadly combat, with the threat to India of Japanese invasion creating an urgent military situation, to allow the deadlock to continue is criminally suicidal. This disastrous political situation has already had serious repercussions upon the economic life of India and aggravated the food situation to the point of famine.

In order to pave the way for the request o Parliament to sanction a further period of dictatorial powers in India, the Government published a White Paper.

This document was to have condemned the Congress in the eyes of the world. Mr. Amery based his speech on this collection of extracts from statements and writings alleged to have been issued by the Congress and individuals. In order to make a case the Government have had to resort to the use of a number of spurious documents which were certainly not Congress, and which they, in any event, would have the utmost difficulty in proving authentic.

The speeches of Mr. Amery and Mr. Attlee, on behalf of the Government in the House, can have no other effect than the further embittering of relations between this country and India. How can we end this position and break through the barrage of lies and distortion?

An examination of the correspondence between Mr. Gandhi and the Viceroy will help one to get a correct picture. This correspondence is very revealing. Within a few days after his arrest last August Gandhi wrote to the Viceroy. The first letter sharply criticises the Government action of precipitating a crisis without considering the Congress case. In refuting the charge that the Congress wished to dominate minorities, the following paragraph in Gandhi's letter is important:—

> The Government of India have not condescended to consider the Congress offer that if simultaneously with the declaration of the Independence of India they could not trust the Congress to form a stable provisional Government, they should ask the Muslim League to do so, and that any National Government formed by the League would be loyally accepted by the Congress. Such an offer is hardly consistent with the charge of totalitarianism against the Congress.

The letter was a plea to the Government to reconsider its policy in regard to India, to which the Viceroy replied that he could not accept the criticism or the request for the Government to reconsider its policy. Gandhi wrote again on September 21, to which he received a formal acknowledgement. There was no further correspondence until December 31, when Gandhi again took the initiative and wrote to the Viceroy.

t

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

During this period the political situation had considerably deteriorated. With the continued imprisonment of the Congress Leaders bitter feeling ran high; the severest repression was met with sabotage and riots. The black tragedy of these last nine months is partly revealed in replies to questions in Parliament by the Secretary of State for India, Mr. Amery. 40,000 anti-Fascist fighters are behind prison bars, 15,000 without trial. To another question Mr. Amery replied:—

My information relates to the period from August 9 to November 30, during which 1,028 persons lost their lives in connection with the disturbances, and 3,215 were more or less seriously injured. During the same period 958 sentences of whipping, or as it should be described, of caning, were imposed in British India, excluding the United Provinces for which figures have not been included.

The Communist Party of India, along with the Trade Unions, Peasant Organisations and Student Movement, gave the lead against sabotage and to win the people for Unity in the fight against Fascism.

In response to the call for National Unity, leaders of various sections held the important Conference in Allahabad in September last year. Mr. Rajagopalachari, former Premier of the Government of Madras Province, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, representing Liberal opinion; the representatives of the Trade Union Congress; the All-India Peasant Committee; and the Communist Party, all agreed to proposals which they believed would form the basis of agreement. The main question was: How to discuss these proposals with the Congress leaders? Permission was sought on the basis of a widely signed appeal to the Viceroy that Mr. Rajagopalachari should be allowed to visit Gandhi. This was refused.

The Government were professing that the only thing that prevented a settlement in India was the question of Unity among the Indians themselves, but they were responsible for preventing the Indians getting together to formulate proposals that would overcome the impasse. In attempting to break this disastrous political deadlock, for which the Government were wholly responsible, Gandhi reopened correspondence with the Viceroy on December 31, 1942. Mr. Gandhi followed up the Viceroy's short reply on January 19, saying that he could not remain ". . . a helpless witness to what is going on in the country, including the privations of millions owing to universal scarcity stalking the land." Here he is referring to the terrible economic conditions, famine and starvation at present the main feature of India. He concluded this letter as follows:

To sum up: (1) If you want me to act singly, convince me that I was wrong and I will make ample amends. (2) If you want me to make any proposal on behalf of Congress you should put me among the Congress Working Committee Members. I do plead with you to make up your mind to end the impasse.

The Viceroy, in his reply to this letter, ignored Gandhi's request to confer with other members of the Working Committee and said he was anxious to learn of "any specific propositions" from Gandhi. Further, if Gandhi repudiated and dissociated himself from the resolution of August 9, then he (the Viceroy) would consider the matter further.

Gandhi sent a letter in reply on January 29:—

You have not even said what part of the August resolution is bad or offensive in your opinion. That resolution is in no way a retraction by Congress of its policy of non-violence. It is definitely against Fascism in every shape or form. It tenders co-operation in the war effort under circumstances which alone can make effective and nation-wide co-operation possible. Is all this open to reproach? Objection may be raised to that clause of the resolution which contemplated civil disobedience. The manifesto by itself cannot constitute an objection since the principle of civil disobedience is implicitly conceded in what is known as the Gandhi-Irwin pact. Even that civil disobedience was not to be started before knowing the result of the meeting for which I was to seek from you an appointment.

Referring to the tragic situation which had resulted in India, Gandhi said:

Add to this tale of woe the privations of the poor millions due to India-wide scarcity, which I cannot help thinking might have been largely mitigated, if not altogether prevented, had there

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been a *bona fide* National Government responsible to a popularly elected Assembly.

The Viceroy, in his replies, as the correspondence developed, was determined not to be in any way conciliatory. The last letter contained a sinister threat that charges were being prepared in respect of violence, and that Gandhi and other Congress leaders would have to clear themselves before world opinion. But Gandhi asks for evidence—which is not forthcoming—and turns to the Viceroy, saying:—

You have condemned men and women before trying them and hearing their defence.

This correspondence showed the intense desire of Gandhi to find a way out of the deadlock, while the attitude of the Viceroy was obdurate. It must be admitted, despite the fact that Gandhi was imprisoned, that he took the initiative towards conciliation. He backed this up with his fast. Here the Government courted catastrophe and disaster. Special instructions were issued to the press on how to handle news arising out of this situation, and with the radio every effort was made to belittle the ever-growing support for the cause which Gandhi symbolised.

One of the most disturbing incidents, for the Government, in connection with this period under review, was the resignation of three members of the Viceroy's Executive Council—the Minister of Supply, Sir H. P. Mody; The Minister of Education, Mr. N. R. Sarkar; and the Minister of Indians Overseas, Mr. H. S. Aney. So that, while the Viceroy in his letter to Gandhi made reference to the fact that the repression of the Congress was endorsed by the Viceroy's Council, these three Indians wanted to end the deadlock, and were not prepared to follow the Viceroy in his disastrous policy.

A meeting took place in Delhi of 200 prominent politicians of all parties, except the Congress (because they were unable to be present) calling for the release of Gandhi. Although their meeting did not secure this, it did take the question of Unity a big step forward.

Insistent demands for the release of Gandhi and the reopening of negotiations poured in from working-class and peasant organisations right through to the Central Legislative Assembly, where they were voiced by Mr. N. M. Joshi, the Labour representative.

The Communist Party of India issued a manifesto in which they declared that the "future of the Indian nation depends on whether we get Gandhi out or not." This is as true to-day as it was when Gandhi was undertaking his fast. The manifesto went on to say that Gandhi's stand was "a desperate summons to the entire nation to save itself from extinction," and made a strong appeal to all patriots to unite, and in Gandhi's name called for the stopping of sabotage and the smashing of fifth column elements. Prison bars, it stated, are now the main obstacle to Congress-League agreement, and the National Government which the League desires as much as the Congress.

The Communist Party's call for Congress-League Unity is not just a mere slogan. Readers will have studied the extremely capable and clear case put by G. Adhikari in the document "Pakistan and National Unity" which appeared in a previous issue. Our Indian comrades knew that their document and resolution presented the means of overcoming the barriers built up by the Government in order to prevent the fulfilment of the national demand.

Throughout the world grave concern was aroused in respect of India, and although people like Lord Halifax, in New York, stressed the point that Britain would not tolerate intervention on this question, American Press and American opinion were greatly disturbed. In this country Mr. Amery had to admit that he had been inundated with resolutions and demands from influential bodies and working-class organisations, not only for the release of Gandhi and the Congress leaders, but for the reopening of negotiations. Members of Parliament were also lobbied on this question. Meetings were

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

held all over the country, and particularly important was the meeting held in the House of Commons by Members of Parliament and others. Those present included Canon Holland, Miss Agatha Harrison; the Rev. H. Carter; Mr. H. H. Elvin (ex-Chairman of the Trade Union Congress); Mr. P. Sloan, M.P.; Mr. Silverman, M.P., Miss Agnes Hardy, M.P., Mr. B. Riley, M.P., Mr. R. Richards, M.P., Mr. R. W. Dobbie, M.P., The Rev. Sorensen, M.P., Lord Strabolgi, etc.

A deputation from this meeting waited on Mr. Amery, the Secretary of State for India, who gave no hope for a change of Government policy, but hinted that with regard to the question of contact between Gandhi and Congress Leaders, and Gandhi and other Indian leaders, this may be considered when Gandhi's fast had terminated. This hope now seems as far off as ever.

The *Manchester Guardian*, in a leading article on February 20, strongly criticised the way the Government is handling the situation in India. It says:

> Does the public of this country realise that between August 8 and December 1 of last year, 60,229 Indians were arrested; that on December 1 39,498 were still under arrest; that the police opened fire on 470 occasions and the troops on 68? Whosever the original responsibility, these terrible figures certainly increase ours now.

It refers to, and quotes from, the *Gandhi - Viceroy correspondence*, and draws attention to the fact that if the Viceroy had accepted Gandhi's proposals that he be put among the working committee of the Congress, and that if other representative Indian Leaders like Mr. Rajagopalachari were allowed to visit them in prison, a way out may have been found. In any event no harm would result. This article goes on to say: "The truth is that, whether the Indian Government and any of the rest of us like it or not, Mr. Gandhi has opened a new phase." It then suggests that the opportunity should now be taken for the reopening of negotiations.

The main concern at the moment is to end the deadlock, and make it possible for the Indian people to tackle the serious problems confronting them: the defence of their country, the economic situation, and so on.

On April 1 in Delhi, a deputation of Indian leaders submitted a Memorandum and asked the Viceroy to receive a deputation. The memorandum once again asked if the Viceroy would allow a few of the leaders to discuss with Gandhi to ascertain authoritatively his reactions to events, and to explore avenues of reconciliation. The memorandum stated: "We feel that though order might have been restored on the surface, every day that passes without a solution of the Indian problem intensifies the hostility between Britain and India, and renders any future solution more and more difficult to attain, until we apprehend it may become even impossible. We are convinced that Gandhi's assistance is essential for restoration of good-will and for a solution of the problem even for an interim period, including an adjustment of Hindu-Moslem claims. On the other hand, unpleasant as it is, we cannot help feeling that refusing to permit us to have any contact with Gandhi now would be equivalent to a determination on the part of Great Britain that there should be no attempt at a settlement of the problem, and no reconciliation between nationalist India and Britain. . . . The situation is growing more and more serious every day, and we feel that a Government commanding the loyal and affectionate cooperation of all the people can be constituted for the period of war only if we are permitted to talk with Gandhi, consult him and obtain his support. The request that we make is intended to achieve this object."

The actions of Mr. Amery completely contradict his words. He concluded his speech in the House by speaking about our good-will to India and our desire to help towards a settlement. Yet within twenty-four hours these Indian leaders

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

received an unwarranted rebuke from the Viceroy and a blank refusal to their request to be allowed to consult Gandhi and the Congress leaders on this question.

How is it possible to overcome the deadlock if the leaders of the most important political organisations are completely cut off from outside contact. The police guards are increased—the Congress leaders are hermetically sealed against the outside world. The reactions of the leaders who received the rebuke are serious. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru characterises the Commons debate on India as the most fatuous for the last four years, and in respect of the reply of the Viceroy to their memorandum he observed that it was most unfair, and says: "A National Government is meaningless without the consent and support of all parties."

Mr. Rajagopalachari, commenting on the Viceroy's action, said: "I must infer from the Viceroy's reply that the Government not only do not desire reconciliation, but wish to humiliate the Congress."

Repression continues, bitterness grows and the deadlock remains—a completely indefensible situation. The Gandhi correspondence shows that the Congress is ready and willing to make their contribution to a solution of the deadlock. They must be allowed to do so.

We must, as our contribution, bring pressure to bear upon the Government to end immediately the policy of repression; to release all anti-Fascist political prisoners, and reopen negotiations with Congress leaders and leaders of other political organisations on the question of the immediate establishment of a composite Provisional Government for India.

Book Reviews

Inside Nazi Germany

The Seventh Cross by Anna Seghers (Hamish Hamilton, 9*s*., 322 pp.).

ANNA SEGHERS' latest book is a very great and beautiful novel. But it is even more. It will live on in the history of literature as the first broad and realistic canvas of life inside Nazi Germany and a true portrayal of the German people in the fifth year of Hitler's regime of terror and demagogy. It shows the depressing picture of a country dominated by fear, of a Germany where much too many men and women do not dare to speak and act freely and thus become silent, apathetic and guilty, where only in the hearts of the few, of a small minority, the torch of liberty, decency and solidarity, is burning.

The fascinating story of the one hunted fugitive, who, fleeing with six comrades from the concentration camp of Westhofen, alone escapes to safety and freedom, thanks to the assistance of a few courageous men and women, is a documentary key to the understanding of the Germany of to-day, to that Germany which, in its overwhelming majority, wages Hitler's war of aggression against the free and freedom-loving peoples of Europe.

After reading Anna Seghers' clear analysis of the German mind in 1938, we understand much better why German soldiers fought at Stalingrad and Veliki Luki until their last cartridge, why millions of German workers are still producing the weapons with which the S.S. maintains the New Order in Europe and why it is possible that German youths should be committing, on the orders of their generals and S.S. group leaders, those abominable crimes in the occupied countries which have disgraced for ever the name of the German people.

But when we are following with Anna Seghers (who herself, with her husband and her children, escaped from German-occupied Paris to the South of France and from there found asylum in Mexico) the trail of the hunted George Heisler, moving like a shadow through a shadowed world of a Germany under the Gestapo and being helped into safety, in spite of heartrending dilemmas, by his political friends, we are inspired and filled with hope that from the ashes of Nazi Fascism there will arise a new, a free and a true democratic Germany. In spite of Hitler, in spite of fear, in spite of Fascist poison, "Trotzalledem," as Karl Liebknecht taught us.

When the escaped and recaught prisoner Wallau, whom his brother-in-law delivered to the Gestapo, was brought back to the camp, the hopes of his fellow prisoners went down. They thought of the many thousands of devoted and staunch fighters who had been murdered by the Hitlerite gangsters. They realised that "a whole generation had been annihilated." They feared that

> the almost unprecedented in history, the most terrible thing that could happen to a people was now their fate: a no-man's land was to be established between the generations, which old experiences would not be able to traverse. If we fight and another

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> takes up the flag and fights and falls too, and the next one grasps it and he too falls—that is natural, for nothing can be gained without sacrifice. But what if there is no longer anyone to take up the flag, simply because he does not know its meaning? . . . The best that grew in the land was being torn out by the roots because the children had been taught to regard it as weeds. All those lads and girls out there once had gone through the Hitler Youth, the Labour Service and the Army, would be like the fabled children nurtured by animals, who finally tore their own mothers to pieces.

The rescue of George Heisler, of only one out of seven, by the underground organisation, by the efficient and conspirative co-ordination of courageous and self-sacrificing efforts of workers and intellectuals, shows that there are still a few who continue to carry the flag hidden in their hearts. Anna Seghers' story even shows more. One audacious deed opens the eyes of those who have become indifferent and lost faith, who have been overpowered by the feeling that the enemy is all too powerful, makes them breathe more freely and ready to take part in an action even if its scope is only limited to the saving of one life.

Anna Seghers' beautiful novel gives us new hope and confirms our belief that Fascism has not succeeded in killing all that was good, decent and great in the German people. It is the common man in all ways of life that saves George Heisler for a new and free life.

The day must and will come, when not only the few but also the many of Germans will realise that Hitler has driven the German people into the national catastrophe and that only united action for the overthrow of the oppressors can save them.

HANS KAHLE.

Marx-Engels Selections

Karl Marx, Selected Works (Lawrence & Wishart, 8s6*d* and 10s6*d*).

ONE CANNOT help reading these two excellent volumes without a feeling of regret for past labours lost, of the constant searching for this or that article or book and of the ploughing through of bad translations, which has been the unfortunate lot of the would-be British student of Marxism in the past. Now every worker, who is fortunate enough to obtain a copy of this limited edition of Selected Works, gets an incomparable treasure, the essentials of Marxism—not just a guide to it—prepared by the best scholars of the international movement, under the editorship of V. Adoratsky.

The name of C. P. Dutt as the English editor is the guarantee of the reliability and clarity of the English translations.

What shall I read in order to understand Marxism? How many times this question is asked to-day! The answers are many and varied. Now, indeed, it is possible to give an answer that is completely satisfactory to every serious enquirer. The British working class movement would have been spared a great deal of pain, ignorance and stupidity if only these two volumes had appeared earlier on the scene. Some of the odd "Marxist" sects which have flourished in different corners would probably not have passed the incubator stage.

The contribution made by Marx and Engels to human knowledge is so vast and profound that it is not possible for those who labour under the conditions of capitalism and whose early schooling has provided no approach to Marxism to find their way through this amazing wealth of literature without the aid of eminent scholars such as are gathered at the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute for the benefit of the international working class. These are two volumes that save us from floundering in the vastnesses of unguided self-education and bring within our reach the basic teachings of the great masters.

The first volume, which is mainly devoted to a general exposition of the theoretical basis of Marxism, contains, in addition to the writings of Marx and Engels, material from the works of Lenin, Stalin, Lafargue and Wilhelm Liebknecht. The reader is thus provided with an exposition of the meaning of Marxism by its two greatest disciples, Lenin and Stalin, and warm human pictures of Marx himself by his own comrades. The result is an harmonious view, not only of Marx as a scientist, revolutionary and family man, but also of Marxism as a guide to action, a theory constantly tested and enriched by action.

Volume two, which consists exclusively of the writings of Marx and Engels, is mainly historical in character, and covers Britain, Germany, France, Ireland, India and Russia. Plenty there for thinking over.

Those members of the Labour Party Executive, who have lately denounced the principle of a common international policy, would find, if they cared to read this volume, that this principle was first embodied in the provisional rules of the Working Men's International Association of 1864, to which the British trade unions belonged. Clause 6 reads :—

> . . . when immediate practical steps should be needed, as, for instance, in case of international quarrels, the action of the associate societies be simultaneous and uniform. Whenever it seems opportune, the General Council shall take the initiative of proposals to be laid before the different national or local societies.

And that was eighty years ago!

The relatively high price of these volumes has not prevented them from being sold out immediately following publication. It is to be hoped that a second and larger edition will be shortly available.

WILLIAM RUST.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Travesty of Jaurés

Jean Jaures by J. Hampden Jackson (George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 12*s*6*d*).

THIS BOOK purports to be a portrayal of the "life and work" of the great French Socialist Jaures. Its author became known by his favourable accounts of Finland. Now that Fascist Finland has turned out to be different from what many people imagined some three years ago, Mr. Jackson has turned to a description of an imaginary Jaures. He hopes that the tradition of this Jaures can be used in opposition to the tradition of Lenin. With these hopes in the mind of the author, it can be understood that the attempts he has made to overcome previous lack of familiarity with the subject by voluminous reading do not, and cannot, result in true portrayal, nor can the book receive the lenient sentence that falls to a well-meant offering of homage to a great socialist. For this book is not pro-Jaures, as Jaures really was, but is simply anti-Marxist and anti-Communist.

Let us quote one who knew Jaures (and who should be more sympathetic to the author than myself) the veteran Belgian Socialist Louis de Brouckere, writing in *France:*—

"If I discussed the part of the book on the action of the *Maitre* I would without doubt courteously rebuke the author on the question of the chapter on Socialist unity. If one followed Mr. Hampden Jackson, one would admit that Jaures achieved it despite the narrow-minded incompetence of nearly all other Socialists. How does he not see that its achievement in these conditions would be artificial and vain, destined to die with its author. The greatness of Jaures precisely consisted in that he understood the substantial unity of French Socialism, despite the superficial quarrels which for some time divided it. . . ."

Or to take a French reviewer, Paul Vaucher in *La Marseillaise:*—

"The seduction exercised by Jaures has, without doubt, prevented the author from altogether understanding and giving life to the other personalities he was fighting."

The man who wrote glowing accounts of Finland does not trouble to get his facts right about the internationally important question that arose from the actions of Paul Millerand, whose obituaries last month as ex-President of the French Republic vividly recalled the career of a notorious renegade.

The entry of Millerand (then a Socialist) into the Waldeck-Rousseau Government in June, 1899, caused a great stir in the French Socialist movement. The author takes it upon himself to state that the Marxist line against Millerand was defeated at the congress of the Socialist organisations at Salle Japy, when in fact the congress decided by 818 votes to 634 that the "class struggle did not authorise the participation of a Socialist in a bourgeois government." But Jules Guesde is further accused ("defeated in the French field") of taking the question to the International. It was debated at the Amsterdam (1904) Congress of the Socialist International, but not to overturn a French decision.

Guesde and the French Marxists are further said to have been defeated on this same question "at the Bordeaux Congress of the French Socialist parties in April 1903."

The author does not distinguish between *Parti Socialiste de France* and *Parti Socialiste Francais.* For while the former, of which Guesde was a member, held its congress at Rheims in 1903, the latter, of which Jaures was a member, held its congress at Bordeaux that year.

It is true that Jaures, having become a Socialist, attempted to reconcile Marxism and idealism; it is true that in general he was with the right wing of the movement; but if he had been anything comparable to what Hampden Jackson wants to make him, he would nearly have been a Poincare or a Tardieu.

No, Jaures was too great a man to allow his memory to be soiled by this writer, an apt disciple of Vansittart, and that when dealing with the great internationalist and great Frenchman—Jaures. Needless to say, the great final Marxist phrase uttered by Jaures at his last meeting, an international meeting held at the Cirque Royal in Brussels, on July 28, 1914, is not quoted. Jaures declared:—

"Capitalism carries in itself war as the clouds carry the storm."

WILLIAM ZAK.

The Editor of LABOUR MONTHLY will be very glad to receive contributions in the form of finished articles or of suggestions and data for articles. The customary proviso must be made that no responsibility is undertaken for manuscripts sent to him nor can he promise to enter into correspondence regarding contributions not accepted.

The articles in the LABOUR MONTHLY are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York City, U.S.A., as well as in the annual index in each December issue.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: 12 months 7s., 6 months 3s. 6d. Postage paid.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DO IT NOW—DON'T HESITATE

Start a LABOUR MONTHLY Discussion Group in your district. With our list of Groups which we have printed for the last two months we have asked you to write in for particulars of how to form a Discussion Group if your town is not mentioned. No doubt you have thought, well, it sounds easy, but is it? Consider it this way, and we think that you will agree with us that it is. Think of the number of people you talk to about the day-to-day news, your neighbour, friend, workmate, or that person you see each day in the train or bus. They could all have a better and clearer understanding if they talked things over at an organised discussion. They would, no doubt, welcome the opportunity and bring along those other people with whom they talk. Invite them along to a discussion, the Guide which we issue will help you and we shall be glad to give you any further assistance.

The Groups are not selective circles, but aim to bring in all who are keen to discuss political problems, irrespective of whether they have ever taken an interest or not before. Everything to-day is political, people cannot help discussing politics, and because they have not done so before, are all the more eager to learn and talk about things with others.

All enquiries to Discussion Groups Department, LABOUR MONTHLY, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3. Please send STAMPED ADDRESSED ENVELOPE.

Discussion Guide can be purchased by individual subscribers at a cost of 2*s.* per annum.

Publications Received

Physics and Philosophy by Sir James Jeans (Cambridge University Press, 8*s* 6*d*, 222 pp.).
The Modern Democratic State. Vol. I by A. D. Lindsay (Oxford University Press, 12*s* 6*d*, 286 pp.).
Women in War Factories by Amabel Williams-Ellis (V. Gollancz, 1*s*, 95 pp.).
What is Marxism? by Emile Burns (V. Gollancz, 2*s*, 67 pp.).
What Does Gandhi Want? by T. A. Raman (Oxford University Press, 3*s* 6*d*, 117 pp.).
The Soviet Way by Pieter Keuneman (Olga Book Co., Ceylon, 262 pp.).
Under Nazi Rule by Ledi Keuneman (Mohan & Bhatt, Colombo, 64 pp.).
Ten Years of Fascism (I.N.G. Publication, 52 pp.).
What It Means (L.R.D., 3*d*, 16 pp.).
Economic Efficiency and Social Welfare by A. L. Macfic (Oxford University Press, 10*s* 6*d*, 142 pp.).
The Criminal Mannerheim Gang Will Not Escape Its Responsibilities! (A "Soviet War News" Pamphlet) (Hutchinson, 6*d*, 24 pp.).
Believers and Clergy of the U.S.S.R. (A "Soviet War News" Pamphlet) (Hutchinson, 3*d*, 8 pp.).
The Development of the Labour Movement in Great Britain, France and Germany by W. A. McConagha (Oxford University Press, 15*s* 6*d*, 200 pp.).
Speeches of General de Gaulle (Oxford University Press, 3*s* 6*d*, 116 pp.).
Works Canteen and the Catering Trade (L.R.D., 6*d*., 48 pp.).
Indian Politics, 1936-1942 by R. Coupland (O.U.P., 7*s*. 6*d*., 344 pp.).
Review—43. Vol. 1, No. 1. Quarterly Review of Literature, Art and Science (Allen & Unwin, 2*s*. 6*d*., 50 pp.).
Enquire Within on the U.S.S.R. Edited by Reg. Bishop (R.T.D., 6*d*., 38 pp.).
The Spanish Labyrinth by Gerald Brenan (C.U.P., 21*s*., 384 pp.).
(South Africa) Communists Plea for Victory (6*d*., 48 pp., C.P.S.A.). We South Africans, 1943 (C.P.S.A., 9*d*., 40 pp.).
Hitler Agents Exposed by John Mahon (C.P.G.B., 3*d*., 20 pp.).
Memorandum on the Service of Youth (Y.C.L. pamphlet, 1*d*., 8 pp.).
Nazi Massacres of the Jews and others (V. Gollancz, pamphlet, 2*d*., 16 pp.).
The People's Charter by H. N. Barnes (Allen & Unwin, 2*s*. 6*d*., 164 pp.).
Know Your Enemy! by Lt.-Col. Hans Kahle (I.N.G., 6*d*., 24 pp.).
Under Stalin's Command by Lt.-Col. Hans Kahle (R.T.D. pamphlet, 1*s*., 44 pp.).
Fabian Socialism by G. D. H. Cole (Allen & Unwin, 7*s*. 6*d*., 172 pp.).
Workers of Britain Unite by Harry Pollitt (C.P.G.B. pamphlet, 2*d*., 20 pp.).
University of Pennsylvania Bicentennial Conference (O.U.P., 12*s*., 184 pp.).
France, Britain and the Soviet Union by Fernand Grenier (R.T.D. pamphlet, 2*d*., 12 pp.).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

China's fight

for freedom and independence—the hard struggle for national unity, explained by a Marxist.

BIRTH OF NEW CHINA

Arthur Clegg

Ready **3/6** *Shortly*

LAWRENCE & WISHART LTD

2 Southampton Place, W.C.1

Trade Dept. : **2 Parton Street, W.C.1**

THE ROAD TO LABOUR UNITY

by *R. Palme Dutt*

48 pages . . . **6d** (*Post paid* 7d)

The real issues involved in the Affiliation question, discussed in terms of the development and advance of the British Labour movement. An indispensable pamphlet for Labour Party and Communist Party members.

by *R. Page Arnot*

THERE ARE NO ARYANS . . . 6d

(Post paid 7d)

The racialism nonsense of the Nazis subjected to examination in the light of modern science. Written in popular style, this gives the ordinary man and woman the reply of science to the racial "arguments" of anti-Semitism.

Labour Monthly Pamphlets • 134 Ballards Lane, LONDON · N.3

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Evans, Spencer & Co. Ltd., London, E.C.4.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED